

# THE TRIAL

OF



## WILLIAM PALMER

FOR THE

### RUGELEY POISONINGS.

---

LONDON: HENRY LEA, 22, WARWICK LANE.

LONDON:  
TAYLOR AND GREENING, PRINTERS,  
GRAYSTOKE-PLACE, FETTER-LANE.



**THE LAST MOMENTS OF THE CONDEMNED,**  
BEING THE WHOLE OF THE CIRCUMSTANCES  
ATTENDANT UPON THE  
**LIFE OF WM. PALMER**  
IN STAFFORD GAOL.

**Together with an Account of his Execution**  
**ON SATURDAY, JUNE 14, 1856.**

**PRICE ONE PENNY.**

**PRINTED AT THE OFFICE OF THE MANCHESTER SPECTATOR.**

THE CORONER'S VINDICATION.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE TIMES.

Sir,—I notice in your paper of Saturday last the publication of a resolution of the Coroner's Society, proposed by Mr. R. Bemridge, coroner for Devonshire, censuring my conduct on the occasion of holding the inquest on the body of John Parsons Cook.

I am not a member of that society, and I must say I do not think such a resolution would have been passed had they been in possession of the whole facts, and more particularly had that society been aware that I shall shortly have an opportunity of vindicating my conduct in reference to the Rugeley inquests before the Lord Chancellor, and until then I trust the public will reserve their opinion and not be biased by any publication founded on a one-sided statement. As you have published the resolution be kind enough to insert this communication.—I am, Sir, yours obediently,

WM. WEBB WARD, Coroner.

Stafford, June 3.

THE MEDICAL EVIDENCE.

The following letter appeared in the *Times*, addressed to the editor:—Sir,—I find in your paper of this day a paragraph relating to me, which contains many inaccuracies which I feel it necessary to contradict. I was called upon by the solicitor for Tawell to make some experiments to elucidate the case; and was also in court to watch the chymical evidence for the prosecution, in company with Professor Graham and Dr. Letheby. I was satisfied that what was produced in court was evidence of the existence of prussic acid in the stomach of the deceased, and told Sir F. Kelly so. I left Berkhamstead before the defence was commenced; consequently, I was not a witness for the defence at all. I did not wait upon the Home Secretary, nor did I interfere in any way after I left the court, being fully convinced of Tawell's guilt.

With respect to my opinion regarding Palmer's

case, I learnt on my return here that Mr. Yates had visited Bristol with an anonymous letter in his hand (since acknowledged to be written by Mr. Simmons, magistrate's clerk, Keynsham), and questioned many gentlemen whom I am in the habit of meeting as to whether they had heard me say "that I had no doubt strychnine was in Cook's body, but that Dr. Taylor could not find it;" and "that a word from me would hang the man" (Palmer). They all stated that they had heard me speak of the case, but not in such terms. The Mayor said that "he could not say the exact words, but the impression on his mind was, that I thought there was strychnine there, but that Dr. Taylor could not find it."

Far too much importance has been attached to my words on these occasions, even by the judge, as they were not an opinion given on legal evidence, but my impression from newspaper reports, with their exaggerations, immediately after the inquest, and before I had heard both sides. It was not right that I should have been asked a question upon it, as it was not evidence of my opinion, after having heard all the witnesses for the defence as well as the altered evidence for the prosecution. It is not for me to express an opinion now; the jury have convicted him; but I cannot refrain from saying that it is from circumstantial evidence alone—strong, it is true, but, in the absence of finding the poison in the body, there is no direct proof, and the man may yet be innocent of the murder.

I cannot conclude this letter without noticing two very erroneous opinions, of most mischievous tendency, which have been circulated during the inquiries. The first is, that strychnine cannot be found in the body after a very limited time; that it is absorbed and decomposed in the system. This is a mere assumption, founded on no experiment but failing ones; whereas I have so found it after two months, and also separated it unaltered from the blood, the liver, and the urine. Strychnine is so permanent that even concentrated sulphuric acid does not alter it.



The second is, that prussic acid cannot be found after fourteen days. This is also incorrect. I have detected it in a body after it had been buried two months.

I hope, therefore, that the public will now be satisfied that they cannot be despatched by either of these two poisons without their being detected.

I remain, Sir, yours, &c.,

WILLIAM HERAPATH.

Mansion-house, Old-park, Bristol, June 4.

JOHN SMITH AND THE "TIMES."

To the Editor.

Sir,—The insertion of my letter in the columns of the *Times*, in vindication of my unhappy client, Palmer, was worthy of your uniform spirit of liberality and fair play.

In the leading article of this day, while you pay to my motives an honourable tribute, you at the same time re-open the whole of the case with an ability which, upon first view, lends to its features the complexion of death. You state the following: "His (Palmer's) guilt, on the contrary, was demonstrated by a clear chain of reasoning, which inevitably connected him with the crime." In this statement you beg the whole of the question by assuming a murder had been committed, and all the brilliant invectives which follow are founded upon a fallacious assumption. I boldly and fearlessly state that no case of poisoning was proved in Palmer's case.

The whole spirit of the criminal law was reversed, and the crime itself remained unproved. This was the difficulty which required all the invectives and oratorical powers of the Attorney-General to dispose of. You again state, "Even if Professor Taylor's theory with regard to the absorption of strychnine be proved by subsequent experiments to be erroneous, enough appeared at the trial, not only to warrant, but to necessitate the condemnation of Palmer."

This in plain reality means, if strychnine when administered should be discoverable, still Palmer was guilty of administering strychnine, although it was not discovered. I appeal to you, Sir, whether such reason as this be worthy of the intellect of the *Times*.

You again state, "Mr. Smith should remember that the chemical evidence with regard to the presence or absence of strychnine was one thing, the medical symptoms another." It is not of course for us to suggest what considerations may have acted with greater force upon the minds of the jury, but we should have thought the medical symptoms and the manner of their succession quite conclusive."

Now, if this theory be a true one—namely, that medical symptoms should rank above chemical evidence, that superficial signs are entitled to graver

and weightier considerations than the secret sources from which they spring, the coroner's inquest and post mortem examination should be altogether abandoned. You also state that "strychnine was there, but that the manipulations of Professor Taylor were unskillfully performed."

Do you not think that the context leads to a more natural and easy conclusion, namely, that the manipulations were correct, but that the poison did not exist? Surely Professor Taylor is not at one time to be held up as an unerring authority on the part of the crown, and when his testimony comes in favour of the prisoner to be put down as a blundering operator.

You travel from the chemical and medical proofs of the case to the circumstantial evidence.

Mr. Serjeant Shee gave what I believe was the natural complexion to the evidence, which is perfectly reconcileable with innocence, notwithstanding all that has been said. Relative to this circumstantial evidence, it appears to me like a fine road leading to a swamp, for if strychnine be not found, and science demonstrates it can be, of what value is the circumstantial evidence?

You further say, "For the sake of public security the Home Secretary will not, we trust, listen to any of the miserable attempts which have been made to throw confusion over a case which admits of no doubt whatever?"

I trust that the Home Office, as the grand medium of communication between the crown and outraged justice, will listen to the all-important fresh evidence which will be placed before them. Fortunately, there exists a golden link between the Sovereign upon the throne and the prisoner in the cell—that link is the Home Office. This in some measure atones for the frightful anomaly in law, which, while it allows appeals in civil cases, allows of no appeal where life and death are at stake.

I feel proud to say that a considerable reaction has taken place in public opinion relative to Palmer's case. The people are beginning to think that he was found guilty, not upon what was proved against him, but what remains unproved, simply because murder was assumed.

This is dangerous ground, and makes men tremble for their rights and liberties.

I will trespass upon your space at no greater length, nor ever again trouble you upon the question. I have watched the case through all its progress with all the poor ability I could command, and only fear I have omitted for my client much that might have been said or done for him. I now know my client's case—its weakness and its strength, where it is clear and where doubtful. Nothing could, I think, be concealed from me, and yet, with all this knowledge, and notwithstanding his conviction, I conclude, as William Palmer's brilliant advocate did, by the declaration of the solemn belie



in his entire innocence.—I have the honour to be,  
 sir, your obedient servant,  
 Bacon's Hotel, June 5.

JNO. SMITH.

### PALMER IN STAFFORD GAOL.

THE PRISONER PALMER.—STAFFORD, JUNE 6.

Palmer very seldom alludes to his trial, and when he does so he appears principally to complain of the summing up of the Lord Chief Justice. Since the prisoner's return to Stafford gaol under the warrant of execution, Major Fulford has received some hundreds of letters, from all parts of the country, in reference to the prisoner. Many of them, no doubt, are from well-intentioned persons, and enclosing tracts and religious pamphlets. There has also been a great deal of poetry enclosed in letters, all written with the view of bringing him to a consideration of his position. The governor of the prison was requested to hand these papers to the prisoner, and to acknowledge the receipt of them; and it appears that in consequence of his not having done so some complaints have been made to the post-office authorities, upon the supposition that the letters have miscarried. Major Fulford has received a number of other letters in reference to the prisoner, and some of them are of a very extraordinary character. The following is a copy of one received on Thursday. It was dated from Stafford, and addressed to Major Fulford:—"Sir: Let me acquaint you that it is the intention of Palmer's relatives to get something conveyed to him to destroy himself, and it is believed that his son will be the instrument for so doing. Should that not be accomplished, he will try throwing himself off the gallows. I believe his friends rely upon him 'squaring' one or more of his keepers." This was signed "An Inhabitant of Rugeley," and posted at this town for fear of its being known.

Another communication of a curious kind has also been received from a man at Newport, who expresses an anxious desire to be allowed to act as the executioner, and who states that he shall be "proud" of being the executioner of Palmer. The prisoner is never left a moment alone. Two of the principal warders of the prison are engaged in watching him alternately day and night.—*Evening Star*.

PALMER'S Demeanour.—STAFFORD, JUNE 6.

Since he has been brought back to Stafford no one has seen him—of course with the exception of Major Fulford, the governor, and the Rev. H. J. Goodacre, the chaplain—but his three brothers and his sister. He has not ever been seen by Mr. Smith, his attorney. According to the provisions of the Gaol Act every prisoner under sentence of death is ordered to be placed in some secure confinement, apart from all other prisoners, and no one is allowed to see him except by an order of the visiting justices. This rule has been most strictly enforced, and with the exception of those above

mentioned, no person has been admitted to see the prisoner except Mr. Wright, a gentleman who, from philanthropic motives, visits the different prisons, and who has a special order from the Secretary of State to visit every prison in the country. Ever since the prisoner has been in the gaol since his conviction, he has presented the same cold and unmoved appearance that has characterised him throughout the whole of the proceedings. He has paid very little attention to the exhortations of the worthy chaplain of the gaol; and, although he seemed to be a little moved by the conversation of Mr. Wright, it was very evident that the effect soon wore away, and he speedily resumed his callous and indifferent appearance. Since his return he has never once visited the chapel. He devotes a good deal of his time to reading the religious books that are provided for him, and also the Holy Scriptures, in his cell. Palmer very seldom alludes to his trial. He has stated that he entertained the belief that he should be acquitted all the time the jury were engaged in deliberation. Palmer himself did not desire to have the case removed out of the county of Stafford, but he consented upon the representation that he would have a better chance of acquittal if the case was tried in London.—*Abridged from the Daily News*.

WILLIAM PALMER AND HIS BROTHERS.

The three brothers of the convict—Mr. George Palmer, the solicitor; Mr. Joseph Palmer, formerly of Liverpool; and the Rev. Thomas Palmer—had an interview with him on Saturday last. It may here be stated, that his relatives are permitted to see him one at a time only. His brothers were considerably affected, as might naturally be expected; but Palmer himself remained, to all appearance, unmoved. A paragraph which appeared in a London contemporary, professing to give an account of this interview, though it is preceded by the assertion that "its truth and authority cannot be doubted," is, with but a slight exception, a simple fabrication. The prisoner had some conversation with his brother George, and asked his opinion respecting the probability of a reprieve being obtained. Mr. George Palmer, in reply to his brother's question, made some remarks to the effect that after the manner in which Lord Campbell had summed up, and his learned brothers concurred, there was no hope of a reprieve being granted. During the conversation the prisoner said to his brother, "George, Cook was not poisoned with strychnine." On Monday, the Rev. Thomas Palmer again visited the convict, and presented him with a printed sermon which he wished him to read. The rev. gentleman did not stay longer than a few minutes, as the prisoner requested him to return to his mother at Rugeley by the twelve o'clock train. On Wednesday, Mr. George Palmer, the Rev. Thomas Palmer, and his youngest sister, Miss



## PALMER'S LAST MOMENTS.

Palmer, visited the prisoner. The interview between the prisoner and his sister was most affecting. She exhibited great distress at the awful position in which her brother is placed; but he retained his usual composure of manner. He had some conversation with his sister respecting his only surviving child, a little boy, between six and seven years of age, expressing his anxiety respecting his welfare and prosperity in life in fatherly and affectionate terms. The poor boy is, we are informed, ignorant of the doom awaiting his father, or, indeed, of his confinement in gaol; he being led to believe that he is ill, and is at Birkenhead. He says he is sure there must be something dreadfully the matter with him, or that he would be certain to come home. At the interview on Wednesday, Mr. George Palmer acquainted his brother that memorials were being prepared in his favour in London, Edinburgh, and other places. On Friday, the Rev. Henry Sneyd, of the Woodlands, near Leek, had an interview with the prisoner, and spent some time with him in his cell, conversing with him upon religious matters. We understand that he listened respectfully to all that was said, but exhibited no symptom of relenting or even of depression.—*Staffordshire Advertiser*.

## HOW PALMER "EXPLAINED AWAY" THE STRYCHNINE.

The *Observer*, in giving an account of Palmer's conduct in goal, remarked that he strongly protested his innocence, and said, "In answer to his assertion of innocence, it was observed that the evidence was not only satisfactory and conclusive to the jury and all the judges who presided, but that the public were almost universally of opinion that the testimony brought forward on behalf of the prosecution left no reasonable doubt, and he was asked why he did not give some explanation with reference to the purchase of the strychnine. Palmer, in answer to this, declares that the witness Newton had not spoken the truth with regard to the purchase of the poison on the Monday night. He was then asked what he had to say with regard to the purchase on the Tuesday morning of the six grains, and he replied, with great coolness, that he admitted he did buy six grains on Tuesday, but he said it was absurd to suppose that he should buy such a quantity as that, which was enough to kill half a dozen men, for the purpose of destroying Cook, and he added that he would prove that the strychnine so purchased was all made use of to destroy dogs. He was told that this would have been a very important fact in his favour; and he was asked why he did not prove it at the trial—to which he replied that the only witness who could prove the fact was his groom, and if he had examined him, he would have been believed."

## PALMER'S HOPES OF A RESPITE.

Stafford, June 8.—He has been visited separately by his three brothers and a sister, and it is known

that on every occasion he was told that the exertions on his behalf were going on favourably. This feeling of hope, there is no doubt, buoys him up; and although the Rev. Mr. Goodacre, the chaplain, and Major Fulford, the governor of the gaol, have both earnestly impressed upon him their belief that there is not the slightest chance of the royal clemency being granted to him, and that it is his duty to prepare himself for the dreadful fate that awaits him, it seems that the representations of his friends have more weight with him than the truthful suggestions of the authorities of the prison, and that he clings with a desperate tenacity to the hope of a reprieve. Actuated by such impressions, it is not to be wondered at that Palmer has taken every opportunity of asserting his innocence, and he appeared desirous to court an argument upon which he was convicted. Although the prisoner has declined to avail himself of the screened seat provided for him in the chapel of the gaol, yet it does not appear that he is altogether regardless of his religious duties. The prisoner appears to take advantage of every circumstance likely to operate in his favour, and this was particularly exemplified in his intercourse with Mr. Wright, the gentleman who, for a philanthropic object, devotes a considerable portion of his time to visiting the different gaols of the country, and having interviews with prisoners accused of great offences, and who has a special order from the Secretary of State to enable him to do so. To this gentleman Palmer, while still asserting his innocence, made so great a show of penitence and religious feeling, that he went away deeply impressed in his favour, and with the belief that his conversation had materially softened him. The moment Palmer was alone, however, he resumed his former appearance, and it was apparent to those about him that no real effect had been produced in his mind.—*London Times*.

## PALMER IN GAOL.—STAFFORD, MONDAY.

For the first time since his trial, Palmer, yesterday, attended divine service in the prison chapel, both morning and afternoon. The officers of the gaol state, that not the slightest variation in his appearance or demeanour was observable. He occupied a seat which was screened so as to prevent the other prisoners seeing him. Though not what in Newgate phrase would be called a "condemned sermon," the discourse of the chaplain, the Rev. R. H. Goodacre, specially referred to the awful position which one of his audience occupied. He still seemed buoyed up with the hope that a reprieve will be the result of the efforts being made on his behalf by his relatives and others; and it is understood that the petitions praying for a reprieve will be presented to-morrow (Tuesday) to Sir G. Grey, at the Home Office. It is said that not a bed in the town is left disengaged, and even though the most



exorbitant prices have been paid. The innkeepers are not the only persons who are anticipating the reaping of a golden harvest by the death of a fellow-creature. Opposite the place of execution are a number of enclosed gardens. The owners of these have let them to some unscrupulous speculators, who purpose erecting a series of platforms for the accommodation of those who can afford to pay handsomely for the luxury of gloating over the spectacle.

**PALMER'S DIARY.** — After the conviction of Palmer he expressed to the under-sheriff his deep regret that he was unable, during his sojourn in Newgate, to attend the daily performance of divine service. He added, that the early hour fixed for his trial, and the time that it was necessary for him to bestow in the preparation for his defence each morning, precluded the possibility of his being present. His diary (for 1855) which appears to have been kept with great care, notes the fact that, on the Sunday after his wife's death, and on the Sunday after Walter Palmer's death, he was at church and took the sacrament. The diary is one of Lett's half-crown editions, with a space for every day in the year. Under the head of the 25th January there is the following entry: "At church (Sacrament), Willie (his son) 'poorly.'" The word "poorly" is underlined twice. The prisoner appears to have denoted particular events recorded in his diary by marking asterisks, ranging from one to six or seven in number after certain entries. On the day of Walter Palmer's funeral the entry is marked with three asterisks. On the 22nd of January, the word "Neri," a term of frequent occurrence, is prefixed to the entry—"Mr. Milcrest died." Mr. Milcrest was Mrs. Walter Palmer's father; and the word "died" is underlined twice. The entries throw some additional light upon the transactions with Pratt. Thus, on the 3rd of February, there is the following:—"Mr. Pratt came here from London to get receipts endorsed on Sun and Norwich Assurances." 5th of Feb., "15 dozen of wine in from Pratt." 7th of Feb., "Jere (Jeremiah Smith) and Ben (Thirlby) packed the wine; gave them a bottle each for their trouble." 16th Feb., "Dined with Jere at the 'yard' (Mrs. Sarah Palmer's)." 18th Feb., "Quinquagesima Sunday: at church; Mr. Atkinson preached; dined at the yard." The first entry in the diary having reference to Cook is under the head of March 5th "Cook dined here." The Fast Day, the 19th of March, is duly recorded, and also the circumstance of his having gone to London on the 10th "to see Pratt." On the 6th of April (Good Friday), "At church with Willie." On the 10th of May there is an entry, "Paid Sarah Palmer's bill due." On the 14th there is an entry recording the interesting fact that 6s. 6d. was paid for "the carriage of

whisky," which seems to have cost £29. 10s. 1d. On the 4th of June, "W. Saunders lost on Chicken £100. On the 13th of June (the day of Newton races) he appears to have been fortunate, as the entry is 'Won the Newton Cup with Lurley.' On the 20th of June he paid his rent to Lord Lichfield, and on the same day made this entry:—Lent B. Thirlby £35." This entry is distinguished by six asterisks. On the 25th of the same month:—"W. Saunders and Jere dined here off goose." On the 26th of June, Eliza Thrame, his servant is confined, and the fact is recorded:—"Eliza confined of a little boy, at nine o'clock night." Seven asterisks note this event. Other entries in the same year note that he signed a bill for Saunders, "entirely as accommodation," that he "exchanged a dressing-gown with Potts," and that he "weaned the Duchess of Kent" (a foal). The last entry in the diary records the *post mortem* examination on Cook, and runs thus:—"Attended at p.m. examination on poor Cook, with Dr. Harland, Mr. Bamford, Newton, and a Mr. Devonshire."—*The Observer*.

#### THE COST OF THE TRIAL.

Several exaggerated statements have been made with reference to the cost of trial, but so far as can be ascertained, it will not be £9,000. Of this sum two thirds, or about £6,000, will be borne, in the first instance, by the crown, and the remaining one third by the family of the prisoner. This calculation is, however, independent of the earlier expenses incurred for the post-mortem examination on the body of Cook, the subsequent chemical analysis by Drs. Taylor and Rees, and the expenses connected with the coroner's inquest, all of which was defrayed by Mr. Stevens, the stepfather and executor of the deceased. After the coroner's jury had returned their verdict of "Wilful Murder" against Palmer, in Cook's case, the Solicitor to the Treasury took up the proceedings, and the crown has discharged the whole of the subsequent disbursements.—*The Observer*.

#### A PETITION FOR PALMER.

A petition got up in favour of Palmer says:—"Your petitioners have carefully examined the evidence for and against the prisoner on the trial of the case, and they feel that further investigation is requisite for the purpose of proving whether strychnia is or not traceable under all circumstances where death has been occasioned by it. That there was no proof of the said John Parsons Cook having been poisoned; and the only evidence against the prisoner was purely circumstantial and theoretical. That the most distinguished of the medical men who were examined on the trial stated the advance of science had been such within the last few years that they could not adhere to any opinions propounded and published by them not more than six or seven years ago. That if a reprieve be granted, the said William Palmer will still remain in custody; and



## PALMER'S LAST MOMENTS.

if science or other facts should substantiate his innocence, his life will not have fallen a sacrifice to the comparative ignorance admitted to exist amongst men upon certain undefined diseases; whilst, on the other hand, if the said William Palmer should by the light of science be proved guilty, he would still be amenable to the law's last penalty. Your Petitioners, therefore, humbly pray that your most gracious Majesty will be pleased to spare the life of the said William Palmer. And your petitioners will ever pray, &c."

### PREPARATIONS FOR THE EXECUTION.

STAFFORD, FRIDAY.

The preparations for the execution are nearly completed. There will be several very strong barriers erected for the purpose of preventing accidents, as, from the excitement that prevails upon the subject, it is expected that the crowd will be greater than ever was known on any similar occasion. The magistrates yesterday issued the following notice:—

"The mayor and magistrates of the borough of Stafford hereby give notice that on Saturday morning next, for the purpose of preserving peace and order, and guarding as far as possible against accidents, the police have received instructions to prevent all young persons under the age of 14 from mixing in the crowd, and they also suggest the propriety of all females abstaining from any attempt to approach the county prison, as the risk of personal injury from the pressure of a multitude of people will be very great. The mayor and magistrates likewise request that any person who may intend to erect on their premises any platform or other standing places for spectators will give notice to the mayor not later than 10 o'clock a.m. on Friday next, in order that he may instruct the town surveyor to inspect the same, with a view to guarantee its stability, and the town surveyor will thereupon sign a notification which may be affixed to the erection. The mayor and magistrates furthermore advise the inhabitants not to leave their houses in an unprotected state, such occasions being sometimes embraced by professional thieves to commit felonies.

"Signed by order of the mayor and magistrates,  
"CHARLES FLINT, Magistrates' Clerk."

### UNSUCCESSFUL APPLICATION FOR RESPITE.

Mr. John Smith, "when the sand of William Palmer's life had run to the eleventh hour," applied to secretary Sir G. Grey for a respite for his client. In his letter he commences by "claiming the largest indulgence," and appealing to the "sense of justice" of the right hon. gentleman. He says he grounds his application—"First, Upon the character of Charles Newton, who was the principal witness upon the part of the crown, and whose antecedents were unfortunately unknown to me at the time of trial; as also upon the character of Mills, whose previous history was, until a day or two since, hidden from me. Secondly, Upon the absence of two witnesses who could, as I believe, have given satisfactory proofs as to the disposal of the poisons purchased by the prisoner, as well as to the disposal of Cook's money. Thirdly, Upon the

discrepancy of the medical testimony as to the power of finding of strychnia. And, lastly, The judge's charge."—Mr. Smith then proceeds to shake the testimony given by the witnesses Newton and Mills, as the first, he states, is a thief; and the second, open to a charge of perjury. After alluding to the statements of Dr. Letheby and Mr. Herapath, that they could have found the fifty thousandth part of a grain of strychnia, he concludes thus—

"I, sincerely trust I have given sufficient reasons to postpone the hour of death, and that the 14th inst., which will witness a day of universal joy with our brave allies, the French, in the baptism of Napoleon IV., may not on that day bathe in tears of bitterness, sorrow, and degradation the relatives and friends of the unfortunate William Palmer. May I seek as early an answer as may be compatible with the consideration of this sincere application?

"I am, Sir, your most obedient servant,

JOHN SMITH."

In reply to the above mentioned communication, Mr. Smith received the following:—

"Whitehall, June 12, 1856.

"Sir,—Secretary Sir George Grey has received and considered your letters of the 10th and 11th inst., in behalf of William Palmer, and he directs me to inform you that he can see nothing in any of the points that you have pressed upon his attention which would justify him in interfering with the due course of law in this case.

I am, Sir, your obedient servant,

"H. WADDINGTON.

"Mr. John Smith, Bacon's Hotel, Great Queen-street."

### THE PALMER PAMPHLET.

The following extracts have been selected from the pamphlet by the Rev. Mr. Palmer, in defence of his brother, and addressed to Lord Campbell:—

#### INACCURACY OF MEDICAL EVIDENCE.

Taylor (page 63) mentions the case of M. Pralet, where "Several medical witnesses deposed that the deceased had died from prussic acid, administered to him by M. L'Heritier, the accused. Orfila was requested to examine the medical evidence, and found it extremely defective. The inferences drawn from the application of the medical tests were highly improper, and the results were extremely negative. Had it not been for the interference of Orfila, it is most probable that the accused would have been convicted, more from the strong medical opinions against him than from the medical facts of the case. The witnesses appear to have acted on the principle that the whole of their duty consisted in rendering the charge of poisoning probable, whereas we shall hereafter see that no person can be convicted of this crime on



mere probability. The fact of poisoning must be made reasonably certain either by medical or moral evidence, or by both combined."

#### THE STRYCHNINE.

Had Cockayne been called, as he ought to have been called, he would have proved that he kept a gun loaded in the stable, by order of my brother, to shoot the dogs that worried his brood mares; that he had also threatened to poison them; that the strychnia was purchased for that object, and that he had missed dogs since then, which had been in the habit of prowling about the paddock, and hunting the mares. That my brother left poisoned food about the place is a matter which can be proved only by himself; for these things are not always trusted to servants; and, as it is a positive medical fact that animals to which this poison has been given, go away into secret, concealed, and quiet places, where they die undiscovered, and would be mortally attacked in so short a time, that they could not get to their own homes. Is it not almost demonstrated that this has been the case here, and that my brother is thus made the victim of circumstances, harmless in themselves, but which, having occurred at this precise period, tell now with fearful weight upon his unfortunate case? The crown may cry out, "Produce the dogs, and show us the strychnia in them." With how much more freedom may the condemned man say, "Produce the poison from Cook's body before you hang me, to satisfy a medical theory invented for this trial, and broached against me by a deadly foe."

#### THE MISSING BETTING-BOOK.

Again, when Herring was examined, and Mr. Welsby proposed to give some evidence from the pages of the lost betting-book, about whose disappearance one of the greatest points was made against William, Serjeant Shee said "We cannot have the contents."—Lord Campbell: The last account we have got is, that it was in Mr. Palmer's possession!—Mr. Serjeant Shee: I do not think there is any proof of its ever having been in Mr. Palmer's possession.—Mr. Attorney-general: We show that it was in the dead man's room on Tuesday night before his death, and Mr. Palmer is afterwards seen looking about; we have no one else, my lord, that we can resort to.—[This was utterly false, for the last person who saw it, or swore she saw it, was Mills, and that was on Monday night. Report p. 41.]—Lord Campbell: I do not think we can receive this evidence!—Thus you were about to admit the contents of that book, as the plea that my brother possessed it. A plea entirely untrue, and not only not supported, but even negatived by the evidence. My lord, if you do these things in life and death, who among us is safe?

#### POSITION OF THE BODY AFTER DEATH.

The next witness was Mary Keeling. Mills and

one or two others of the witnesses had endeavoured to show that the body was "bent like a bow," to use the imaginative language of that man Taylor, and this was pressed in to support your view of the case, that "the death was consistent with strychnia." Now Mary Keeling proved the exact reverse of this, but you did not either take it in your notes or read it to the jury, though it was admitted that it had been said, and though it corroborated Dr. Bamford and Dr. Jones, and entirely refuted the "episthotonos" theory of Taylor and Mills, and thus got rid of one of the most remarkable symptoms "consistent with poisoning by strychnia," yet not one word of comment did you offer upon it; but, as you said, it was not upon your notes—where it ought to have been—you left the jury unadvised upon this essential contradiction, which, taken with the evidence of the two medical men, entirely demolish Mills and her congenial companion Taylor, and took out of the mouth of Sir Benjamin Brodie and the other medical witnesses one of those vital symptoms on which they founded their diagnosis of the causes of death. For, if there was no episthotonos, or bent, bow-like shape, then Cook did not die of strychnia; and this being proved not to have been so by these three witnesses, or, at all events, left in deep doubt, my brother was entitled to the benefit of that doubt, and should have been acquitted.

#### VISIT TO WILLIAM PALMER.

My lord, since this conviction of death has been recorded, I have seen William Palmer. I have visited him in his condemned hold. I have beheld that darling brother, the playmate of my infancy, the companion of my youthful sports, in whom my heart's blood circulates, and with whom my love is entwined. And how did he present himself? And how did he bear our presence? I say, like Socrates in his cell; I say, like Sidney in the Tower; I say, like Calas before the wheel. He preserves a cheerful, an undaunted, an English heart and spirit, and I am proud of him, even in his death doom. Your lordship has not crushed or trampled my brother's soul. He maintains his energy and his hope is justice, not, indeed, in men, for he was condemned long since, but in the course of events, in the discoveries of science, in the confession or conviction of those perjured witnesses against him; or, these all failing, in the God of Truth. Though I never doubted his innocence, yet I did resolve to make all certain and positive before I hazarded this letter. I fell upon my knees before him. I implored him, by our past love and kindred, by our early recollections and hopes, by our common faith, by all the duties which he owed to man and God, to disburthen his conscience if he were guilty, and not to enter before the presence of his Creator with a falsehood upon his lips. I adjured him to say, if he were guilty, or no.



guilty. Oh, my lord! he did not wince; he did not change his noble composure, he spoke and looked all innocent. Calmly, earnestly, and solemnly he answered, and the seriousness of his words went into our hearts with the fullest persuasion of his perfect guiltlessness of blood; the most complete reliance on that dying tongue, which never spoke falsely to one of us, but to whose language we listened over with full assurance in its integrity and its faith."

### EXECUTION OF PALMER.

The execution of Palmer took place this (Saturday) morning a few minutes after eight o'clock, in front of Stafford Gaol. The concourse of spectators was as large as the limited space, from which a sight of the execution could be obtained would accommodate, the people being densely packed in close proximity to the gaol, and every adjoining thoroughfare from which even the slightest glimpse of the scaffold could be obtained. There could not be fewer than twenty thousand spectators, notwithstanding which the crowd was quite orderly, and seemed to regard the solemn scene as one of great impressiveness.

Contrary to all usage he was hung in the prison dress, but that was not intended as an indignity, and simply arose from the circumstance that the clothes in which he was tried were left in London, and no others had been supplied to him. His bearing in the last extreme moment of his life elicited the amazement of all who witnessed it. When the fatal hour arrived, the melancholy procession was formed which conducted him from his cell. He marched along with a jaunty air and a tripping gait, and though the distance he had to traverse was considerable, he maintained his bold front to the last, stepped lightly upon the stairs leading to the gallows, took his place on the drop, and confronted the vast multitude below, not without emotion, but without anything like bravado. The work of the executioner was coolly and skilfully performed, and the culprit died in a few minutes, and almost without a struggle.

It rained heavily and incessantly nearly the whole night. So early as nine o'clock in the evening a great crowd, in spite of the rain, had taken up all the best positions in front of the barriers—but the comfortless state of the weather wore out their patience, and before midnight they had almost wholly dispersed, while for an hour or two afterwards, only a few policemen were to be seen on the ground. As the morning advanced, however, the people poured into the town in great force. In the dead of the night, the scaffold, a huge moveable machine was drawn up in front of the prison, and

placed in position. About seven o'clock last night Thomas and George Palmer, visited him for the last time, accompanied by Miss Palmer, his sole surviving sister, and the interview lasted several hours. Yesterday morning, Mr. Smith, his solicitor, was summoned by telegraph from London, to Stafford, at Palmer's earnest request. He arrived here at half-past ten last night, and had an interview with the convict in the presence of Major Fulford, the governor of the gaol. The prisoner had declined to retire to rest until Smith came, and from that circumstance and the anxiety he had shown to have him sent for, it was supposed that he had some important communication to make to him, but it was not so. On going to his cell the governor told Palmer that if he had anything confidential to say on family affairs to Mr. Smith, he (the governor) would keep it a secret. To which the prisoner replied, that he had not, and he hoped that the governor would lose no time in publishing all he said; he also added, that all he had to say was to thank Mr. Smith for his great exertions, the officers of the prison for their kindness to him, and that Cook did not die from strychnine. Major Fulford expressed a hope that in his awful condition he was not quibbling with the question, and urged him to say Aye or No whether or not he murdered Cook. He answered directly that Lord Campbell "summed up for poisoning by strychnine." The Governor retorted—it was of no importance how the deed was done, and asked him to say yes or no to the question. Palmer said he had nothing more to add; he was quite easy in his conscience and happy in his mind. This is the Governor's version of the conversation. But upon the medical point Mr. Smith stated that last night after he had just left the convict, that what Palmer said to him was—"I am innocent of poisoning Cook by strychnine, and all I ask is that you will have the body examined and will see my mother and boy."

The brother and sister remained in the cell until nearly midnight, when they embraced with an intensity of agony it were difficult to describe. The convict retired to rest early in the morning, and slept two and a half hours, when he was visited again by Mr. Goodacre, the chaplain. Between five and six he had some tea, but without eating anything with it.

Shortly after he had another cup of tea, and to the turnkey who gave it to him, and who asked him how he was, he replied he was quite comfortable. As he was about to leave his cell for the last time, he said, in reply to the High Sheriff, that he denied the justice of his sentence, and asserted that he was a murdered man. These were about the last words he uttered—the prison bell tolled for a few minutes and had forfeited his life.

At nine o'clock the body was cut down, and before eleven was consigned to the felon's grave.



with the author's compliments

Linton Lamb

39280

CAMBRIDGESHIRE DOCTORS  
IN THE OLDEN TIME

1466—1827

BY

W. M. PALMER, M.D.







CAMBRIDGESHIRE DOCTORS  
IN THE OLDEN TIME

1466—1827

BY

W. M. PALMER, M.D.





Monday, 1 May, 1911.

The Rev. Dr STOKES, President, in the Chair.

W. M. PALMER, M.D., read a paper on

### CAMBRIDGESHIRE DOCTORS IN THE OLDEN TIME.

The olden time of the healing art reaches from the very beginning of things, until the discovery of the use of antiseptics. But this paper deals chiefly with the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, and has been arranged in the following manner.

1. A brief sketch of some of the sources of information and of the regulations for early medical practice. 2. Remarks on the various grades of medical practitioners. 3. An account of a village practitioner of the sixteenth century, and of another of the seventeenth century. 4. The drugs used. 5. Accounts of several individual Cambridge doctors. 6. Sections on the Fees, Instruments, Libraries, Pictures, Modes of Conveyance, and the Church spoils of early doctors. 7. A sad account of a Cambridgeshire vicar of the fifteenth century, who was dissatisfied with local skill and went to London for "further advice."

#### I. SOURCES OF INFORMATION.

The sources of information about doctors of an early period are to be obtained chiefly from manuscripts which are distributed amongst several more or less inaccessible repositories. Such printed books as there are, for instance Munk's *Roll of the Royal College of Physicians*, and the published works on the Apothecaries' and Barber Surgeons' Companies, did not help one much as regards country practitioners. For Cambridge itself of course, there is a rich mine of information in the works of her great



Town Clerk, although unfortunately they are all without indexes. But I felt ambitious of gathering scraps which had escaped his eagle eye, and besides he did not help me at all with the part of the subject which interested me most, the country village practitioner.

At one time I thought that I had tapped a source of information, the episcopal muniments at Ely, which would give me for the year 1640 a complete list, and something more, of medical practitioners in villages and towns alike. But to explain how episcopal registers concern country doctors, I must here make a digression.

The medical Acts of the last century were not the first restraint on unqualified medical and surgical practice. As early as the year 1421 a project was before Parliament to make ordinances for the punishment of men and women who were practising as physicians and surgeons without licences. It was suggested that such should be fined £40, equivalent to £500 of our money, and imprisoned also, and that the sheriff of each county should make inquisition concerning licensed and unlicensed practitioners<sup>1</sup>. Whether the latter suggestion was carried out I am unable to say. If it was, the returns would have anticipated the earliest Medical Register by four centuries. The sheriffs' accounts and inquisitions are a large class of documents in the P.R.O., but there are certainly no returns for this county.

The first important medical Act was passed in the year 1511. The part of this which concerns country doctors is the clause that no person should practise as a physician or surgeon in any diocese, until he had been examined and approved by the Bishop, aided by such expert persons in those faculties as were convenient. And that being approved, the Bishop should give him a licence under his seal. The penalty for practising without licence was £5, or £50 of our money, for each month in which he so practised<sup>2</sup>.

This Act put the control of the medical profession throughout the country in the hands of the Bishops, with the exception

<sup>1</sup> Rolls of Parliament, quoted in Cooper, *Annals*, i. p. 166.

<sup>2</sup> Young, *Annals of the Barber Surgeons*, p. 72.



of those in the university towns, who were exempted by a special clause<sup>1</sup>.

The regulations for practice being in the hands of the Bishops, it follows that it is likely to be amongst their records that the earliest information about country doctors is to be found. Now the records of the Bishopric of Ely are well catalogued and freely opened to students and seemed to offer me a fine field. With the help of the catalogue I found some large volumes containing licences of several kinds. The earlier volumes have no index, and the contents, licences and letters of administration and sequestrations of livings are mixed. It took me almost a whole day to look through one volume, and as a result, I had found one surgeon's licence dated 1584. It was granted to John Papworth of the parish of Duxford St John, he is the second earliest country surgeon whom I have found. No doubt more licences could be obtained from these volumes, but at the same cost of time, they would be too expensive for my purpose. Quite accidentally I came upon another licence in a precedent book at Ely, which runs as follows. And as this licence was entered in that book as a model form, all other licences issued at that period would be in the same words.

“A licence to practice Chirurgery.

William Gager Doctor of Lawes, Chancellor to the Reverend Father in God Lancelot, by God's providence Lord Bishopp of Ely, To all & singular persons to whome these presents shall come to be reade hard or seene, sendeth greetings in our Lord Everlasting. For as much as by the testimony of divers honest men, I am informed that John Lewis of Cottenham within the county of Cambridge, hath of a long time imployed his labour in the study and practice of Chirurgery, and hath many years practiced the same with very good successe to many that have stoode in neede of his helpe, and so hopeinge of the like successe hereafter, I doe hereby approve him, & give him

<sup>1</sup> This Act created a valuable monopoly, which was abused, so thirty years later it was relaxed, and any one was allowed to treat wounds and outward swellings, and give remedies for stone and ague. Then there arose that class of amateur surgeons of whom William Bulleyn speaks with such approval, Sir Phillip Paris, Sir Thos. Elyot and others of this county.



this my licence to practice Chirurgery within the diocese of Ely during my good will & pleasure, & until such time as I shall revoke and call back ye same, requesting all people quietly to permit and suffer him soe to doe without molestinge troubling or preventing him therefore. In witnesse whereof I have here unto subscribed my name, & sett my seale of office the 25 daye of October 1615."

This licence is not issued in exact accordance with the Act of 1511, since instead of skilled surgeons, the chancellor has taken the testimony of any honest men. The worshipful doctor's wish that success should still attend the surgeon's efforts, is rather quaint.

My next hope was Bishop Wren. He was a great stickler for all details of ecclesiastical rule, and in his primary visitation of this diocese, issued a book of a hundred and forty-seven questions for the clergy and churchwardens to answer. The searching nature of these questions was a matter of great offence to many of his flock, and a huge petition was signed by the laity and clergy of this county against his so-called innovations. The original petition is still in existence in the British Museum. But only two parts of the book touch my present subject.

In a chapter, headed "Concerning Schoolmasters, Physicians, Chirurgeons, Midwives, Parish clerks and Sextons"—a queer mixture—was this question or set of questions:

"What Physician or Chirurgeon have you in your parish, who not being a Doctor of Physick or otherwise sufficiently licenced in either of the universities, doth notwithstanding practice physick ?

What other persons have you among you, either male, or female, who take upon themselves to profess or practice physic or chirurgery ?

And who be midwives in your parish ?"

And at the end of the book there is an order that all physitians, schoolmasters, chirurgeons and midwives, should appear at the Lord Bishop's visitation.

Now if the above questions had been faithfully answered,



and the answers preserved, a fine Medical Directory would have resulted. But unfortunately the only original return which exists is for the village of Shepreth, where the answer is, "We have no phisitian, nor any chirurgian, and only one midwife licensed."

But although the original returns are lost, extracts from them were entered into the Bishop's Court Books, some of which survive. A search through these resulted in the finding of fifteen medical practitioners for the year 1640. Four of these were in the town of Cambridge, and the others at Brinkley, Chatteris, Chesterton, Coton, Cottenham, Ely, Ickleton, Melbourn, Meldreth, Shudy Camps and Wisbech. But this list cannot be complete. From other sources we know that March and Whittlesey had at least one doctor each at this time. The surgeons at Chatteris, Cottenham and Meldreth had no licences, and were forbidden to practise until they were obtained. Concerning Ickleton an interesting item is recorded. A man named Robert Ambrose was presented by the churchwardens for being very often absent from divine prayers, and had to appear before the Ecclesiastical Court. His defence was that he was a surgeon, and was sometimes absent from church because he had to visit his patients during prayer time. The explanation was sufficient, and he was dismissed—*dimittur cum monitione*. The warning must have been "Don't come here and make that excuse too often." This point being settled, the judge said, "You say that you are a surgeon, then show the court your licence to practice physic and surgery." Alas, Robert Ambrose had to own that he hadn't one, and was ordered to desist from practising until he had a licence, which he might apply for at the next Court day. Whether he was fined £5 or not is not stated, but he was certainly mulcted in costs and threatened with the fine. The reflections of Ambrose as he rode back to Ickleton must have been bitter ones, and when the petition against Bishop Wren and Ecclesiastical Courts came round, he was probably eager to sign it. From Melbourn a surgeon came to swear that a man, who had been presented at the Court for not kneeling at the rail when he took the sacrament, had an illness which prevented him from kneeling. The name of the surgeon



at Shudy Camps was Thomas Ady, an unusual surname. In Munk's *Roll* occurs the name of Edward Ady, a master of arts of Emmanuel College, who had received the licence to practise in 1631, and settled somewhere in Essex. Shudy Camps is on the Essex border, so it is possible that the two men may be the same. If so, Ady was the only village practitioner of that century who had the licence of the Royal College of Physicians. At Ely the surgeon was fined for not attending the visitation as ordered in Wren's book of articles. It would cause doctors to grumble very much if they had to spare time for such functions now.

As regards midwives, there were thirty-three in the county and Isle of Ely. Of these some were unlicensed, e.g. at Whittlesey, "Thomasina wife of Humphry Wilbore, hath practised as a midwife these twenty years, but hath no licence." At Parson Drove, "We present Elizabeth Abbye, the wife of John Abbye for taking upon herself the art of a midwife, not having a licence from the Court." She was warned that at the next Court she should exhibit a certificate, not of her fitness, but of having abstained from practising as a midwife, which seems rather a stringent order.

After the Restoration, when Wren returned to rule his diocese, one of the first things he did, undismayed by the result twenty years before, was to send round another book of articles and hold another visitation. The questions were the same as before. A few original returns only survive. Histon, Hungry Hatley and Madingley answered that they had "neither physitian, chirurgeon nor midwife." At Dry Drayton the answer was "None practice physic nor professeth midwifery, but charitably one neighbour helpeth another." The Ecclesiastical Courts must have been as powerless against this kind of thing as the central midwives' board is to-day. At Chesterton there was a surgeon practising without a licence, and a midwife licensed five and twenty years before. I wonder how much better this old gamp was than the charitable neighbours at Dry Drayton!

The foregoing extracts do not exhaust the Ely records with regard to medical practice, but they are sufficient to show that



at one time the country practitioner was almost as much under the control of the Bishop as the clergy. How long the Bishop kept that control, I cannot say. Some Bishops continued to issue licences to practise until well into the eighteenth century, and they may still have the power. But I do not think such licences would be capable of registration.

The regulation of medical practice within the town of Cambridge differed from that in the rest of the county. By an early statute it was ordained that no one should practise physic within the bounds of the university until he had conformed to the rules concerning medical degrees, nor any one practise surgery unless approved by the university examiners<sup>1</sup>. Licences to practise medicine and surgery are entered in the Grace Books, which are now printed to the year 1589. I have left this part of the subject alone, as it would be better undertaken by a graduate. The text-books used by fifteenth century medical students would make an interesting subject.

But I should just mention that one advantage which licensed practitioners in the town of Cambridge had over those outside the town, was, that they were under the jurisdiction of the Vice-Chancellor, and had all the privileges of scholars' servants. Thus it comes about that the wills of apothecaries, barber-surgeons and surgeons, as well as those of physicians, were proved in the Court of the Vice-Chancellor, some of the records of which go back further than those of the Archdeacon's Court. The inventories of the Vice-Chancellor's Court begin about 1520, of the Bishop's and Archdeacon's Courts in 1660. From both sources I was able to get much interesting matter.

## II. GRADES OF PRACTITIONERS.

The grades of medical practitioners appear to have been as follows: physicians, surgeons, barber-surgeons, apothecaries, midwives and bonesetters. The first four may be looked upon as trained, as they had either taken a degree or a licence at one of the universities, or had passed through an apprenticeship.

<sup>1</sup> *Documents*, 1852, Vol. i. p. 362.



The status of the physician was far above that of any of the others. Originally he was an ecclesiastic, which in itself would put him above the surgeon and apothecary, who as a rule were laymen, and without university degrees. John Thomas, of Cambridge, whom I shall mention again, was an exception, as he had been a priest and was a master of arts. There seems to me to be indications that the surgeon of 1540 had a higher status than his successor a century later. The surgeons of London united with the barbers in 1540, which may not have improved their position. At the same time the apothecaries were improving theirs. In the sixteenth century the apothecaries were a part of the Grocers' Company. You will perhaps remember that the house at the S.E. corner of Cambridge market-place, where several generations of apothecaries named Vesey lived, was ornamented with the Grocers' arms. But during the century the apothecaries increased in power, attracting to themselves work from both physicians and surgeons, and in the early part of the reign of James I they seceded from the Grocers' Company and founded one of their own. Certainly in 1600 the apothecaries of Cambridge were a wealthier class than the surgeons. Richard Love, an apothecary who died about that time, left over a thousand pounds personalty, including £800 of savings, whereas Widdows, the Bridge Street surgeon, left under £8. And Leonard Duffield, a surgeon who died in 1577, was not one of those who raked in the shekels of Cambridge dons and undergraduates. His house was of the simplest, containing hall, chamber and kitchen, or they were the only rooms furnished, and yet he was married. Still the hall was fairly well furnished. There were hangings on the walls, a long table, two settles, forms and stools, with nine pewter dishes and fourteen platters displayed on shelves round. But the total value of his personalty was under £9<sup>1</sup>. Mr Pask, another surgeon deceased about the same time, had managed to get £28 worth of property, but these are far below the estate of a surgeon in 1545, when money was relatively of much more value. Even a barber-surgeon of 1604 left property to the value of £17. Perhaps you would like to hear how

<sup>1</sup> Univ. Invent., Bdle 2.



a barber-surgeon lived three centuries ago. The house of Richard Meakes, the man in question, consisted of hall and shop, with chambers over them and a lean-to kitchen. There was a glass window in a frame in his shop front, whereas a surgeon sixty years before had a canvas window. There was nothing in his shop or elsewhere referring to the surgical part of his trade except a bundle of pieces of old linen, valued at 5s., for use after bleeding. Three barber's basins of pewter, a barber's pot and an old laver, and two basins of latten, are valued at 8s. 6d. There was a large quantity of linen such as neckingers, kerchiefs and shaving-cloths, valued at £2, including a face-cloth of cambric valued at 2s. 6d. Altogether his house and shop linen were worth £6, out of a total of £17, so something can be said for the cleanliness of barbers then. The barber-surgeon's apparel was modest, being worth only 12s. Some of his bedding was stuffed with a material not met with before, and that is Fen down. There were two feather beds, a straw bed, a fen down bed, and three fen down bolsters. This fen down may have been from fen fowl, but from the small value attached to it, I should think it was the pappus of cotton-grass or sedge. The barber's literature was as modest as his clothes. Old books and other lumberment are valued at 1s.<sup>1</sup>

Now most of the writers on the history of medicine have been physicians, and they have invariably put the position of the surgeon as a low one. A surgeon, we are told, was not allowed to administer remedies for any internal complaint, nor to perform any major operation without the attendance of a physician, but I think that applied only to London. However that may be, one thing is quite evident, the Cambridge surgeon of the sixteenth century did not make money. The regius professor of physic complained in 1635 that surgeons and apothecaries were much sought after, and physicians seldom, except when the patient was ready to die. But the savings of physicians during his period averaged far more than those of surgeons and apothecaries. The professor in question was Dr Ralph Winterton, who followed Dr John Collins in that professorship. Dr Winterton was evidently on intimate terms

<sup>1</sup> Univ. Invent., Bdle 3.



with the latter, as he received from him a legacy of books and clothes, including a black cloth coat lined with plush. But he did not approve of the manner in which his predecessor granted licences to practise physic. In a letter to the President of the College of Physicians he says that he had grieved to see sometimes an apothecary, and sometimes a serving man, admitted to a licence to practise physic, and he had resolved that no more licences should be issued unless the candidate was worthy<sup>1</sup>. This professor's will was not proved in the local court, so I cannot say how he flourished, but his predecessor, in spite of his lax granting of licences, managed to get a comfortable living.

John Collins held the professorship, which was worth £40 a year, for nine years. At his death his personalty was valued at over £1200, so he had not worked for nothing. He lived in a three-storied house, consisting of hall, parlour and kitchen, each with a bedroom over, and above them other bedrooms, called galleries; attics we should call them. The most noticeable point about his furniture is the number of elaborate chairs and stools. Thus in the hall were a backed chair wrought with Irish tick, and eight high stools of the same (£3. 10s.); eight red leather chairs, a great leather chair, two embroidered chairs, and five embroidered stools (£5. 3s. 4d.). In the parlour were six backed chairs of branched velvet and a great Russia leather chair. In the parlour chamber were two high embroidered chairs and two low embroidered stools (30s.)<sup>2</sup>.

But in spite of Winterton's strictures, it is evident that apothecaries in his day, or at least some of them, were a highly respectable, well connected class. Take for instance John Swetson, who died just before Winterton became professor. His will contains many legacies, including £5 to his laundress, but his wife Dorcas was residuary legatee, and it is the curious legacies of her will which show their respectable society. Her executor and residuary legatee was Dr Robert Eade, a physician and fellow of Caius. To him in 1641 she left her best silk gown, her best satin peticoat laced with gold, and two of her best gorgets. To her loving friend Thomas

<sup>1</sup> Quoted in Cooper's *Annals*, III. 268.

<sup>2</sup> University Inventories, Bdle 7.



Gostling, another physician, she left the gold ring on her finger. To Mr Joseph Loveland, fellow of Trinity College and Rector of Wimpole, she left a pound to buy a ring and another pound to preach her funeral sermon. To the wife of a notary public in Cambridge she left her taffety peticoat laced with silver. And to widow Hammond, a mender of stockings near Trinity College, she left 20s. A stocking-mender seems to be a new profession<sup>1</sup>.

As an example of what apothecaries could do in the way of getting a living in Cambridge, long after Winterton's death, take the case of Thomas Day, an apothecary who died in 1681. He was of no great age, for his mother was alive, and his own son was under age, but he had done very well out of Cambridge people. His clothes, books and ready money were worth £400, his furniture £200, the contents of his shop, drugs, oils, ointments, evators, syrups, conserves, confections, lectuaries, plasters, and powders, pots, stills, alembicks, and skillets were worth £100, and money owing to him £800; total £1500. But this was the least part of his possessions. He had houses in Cambridge and farms in Soham and five other parishes. He bequeathed money to provide twelve old people in the spital house with a warm russet cloth coat every year on S. Thomas's day. His son Robert was intended to succeed him, as he bequeathed all his trade effect to him<sup>2</sup>.

We next come to the apprentices and assistants of early doctors. Most Cambridge practitioners probably had one or more apprentices. Even Dr Collins, the regius professor of physic, had an apprentice to whom he bequeathed a grey coat and an old shirt, and various books, such as *Gerard's Herbal*, *Vigo's Surgery*, and the *London Pharmacopœia*, and all his brewing vessels<sup>3</sup>.

When Dr Allot made his will his apprentice had only served a part of his time, so he bequeathed to him as recompense £40 and his two best cloaks and suits<sup>4</sup>.

And Mr Peter Dent, an apothecary, directed his executors

<sup>1</sup> University Wills, Vol. III. pp. 232 and 264.

<sup>2</sup> *Ib.*, Vol. IV. 229. Invent., Bdle 8.

<sup>3</sup> *Ib.*, III. 210.

<sup>4</sup> *Ib.*, III. 223.



to pay £20 to his son for taking his apprentice for the remainder of his term of years<sup>1</sup>. From these cases it looks as if the apprentices had paid a fairly high premium. This Peter Dent was a well-known botanist, a friend of the celebrated John Ray. His daughter married the vicar of Linton, who fought and won against Pembroke College the great lawsuit concerning the tithe of carrots.

From a chancery document it seems that ten years was the period of apprenticeship for an apothecary. In 1501 an apprentice was bound to an apothecary of Cambridge named Richard Smith for ten years. By the terms of the agreement, Smith was to teach his apprentice the art of an apothecary, to provide him with meat, drink and clothing, and to send him to the grammar school for a year—the latter with the object of learning the necessary Latin. When he had served seven years of his time, the boy ran away from his master, who thereupon sued the boy's relative for damages. The reply was that Smith had not given the boy his exhibition to the grammar school, nor taught him the craft of apothecary, but had set him to other labour, and had given him great strokes, penury and hunger<sup>2</sup>.

Sometimes it is difficult to explain the status of Cambridge surgeons. For instance, John Parman describes himself as a surgeon of Bene't College in his will, made in September, 1545. According to Lamb's *History of Corpus* he entered that College in 1544, but nothing more is said of him. No licence for him to practise surgery appears in the Grace Books, and yet he must have practised, as he directed his instruments to be sold to pay his debts. The disposal of his goods he left to his master, either the master of his college or a surgeon to whom he was apprenticed<sup>3</sup>.

The next grade above the apothecary's apprentice was his assistant, and I can tell you a little about one of them who died in 1603, namely "Thos. Rochell, apothecarie, late servant to John Poley, apothecarie," of Cambridge. Rochell must have

<sup>1</sup> *Ib.*, iv. 309.

<sup>2</sup> Early Chancery Proceedings,  $\frac{252}{13}$ .

<sup>3</sup> Univ. Wills, i. 79.



lived in lodgings, as his only furniture was a clothes chest and two pairs of sheets. His wardrobe was as follows: a cloak, two suits of clothes, each consisting of doublet, jerkin, venetians and worsted socks; three night-caps, three shirts, one pair of boots, and two hats. His only book was a bible, valued at 4s., and his only cutting instrument a rusty sword. The value of his possessions was a little over £2, but his savings amounted to £16<sup>1</sup>.

The lowest grade of medical practitioner was the bonesetter, whose practice was concerned with stiff joints rather than fractures. I found the will of a bonesetter who was buried in Melbourn churchyard in 1615, and another bonesetter named William Fue died at Willingham in 1727. The latter was a small farmer as well as bonesetter. He owned the house in which he lived, and possessed three mares, besides cows, sheep and pigs. His house contained kitchen, hall, parlour and five bedrooms. The possession of a bell metal pot, a silver tankard and silver spoons, shows that he was beginning to afford luxuries, and one can safely say that bonesetters flourished in Cambridgeshire two hundred years ago<sup>2</sup>.

There are no classes of practitioners to-day which exactly correspond with those of the sixteenth century, with the exception perhaps of the bonesetter. There were no prescribing physicians then. Even the great Dr Hatcher had a shop, with a counter, and scales and weights. The ordinary apothecaries and surgeons retailed plasters and pills over their counters, and continued to do so for centuries after. Even within the last dozen years I have looked after a practice where children used to come and ask for packets of salts and senna. But nowadays the retailing of drugs is usually confined to chemists and druggists, whom I first meet with in Cambridge in 1787<sup>3</sup>.

The class of practitioner of the sixteenth and seventeenth

<sup>1</sup> Univ. Inv., Bdle 10.

<sup>2</sup> Consistory Court Wills and Inventories.

<sup>3</sup> John Smithes Crosley, of Cambridge, Chymist and Druggist, made his will 10 Nov. 1787. It was proved in the following July. He bequeathed £800 to his son John Finch Crosley, and £1000 to his daughter Sophia. Both were under age. His wife Jane was residuary. *Liber* xvj. p. 81.



centuries which represents the general practitioner of to-day was the apothecary, a name which has quite dropped out of use. In earlier times still, the medical practitioner was called a leech, a word of Anglo-Saxon origin. We have to-day no concise way of designating the general practitioner of medicine. But the words "apothecary" and "leech" have an honourable lineage, and either of them would be a better term to use than the double-barrelled one "physician and surgeon," which seems to suggest something more than it means.

### III. THE COUNTRY VILLAGE PRACTITIONER OF THE SIXTEENTH AND SEVENTEENTH CENTURIES.

It is the real country practitioner, the doctor living in a country village, with no colleague within several miles, who has most interest for me. But the records of country practitioners of an early date are very difficult to collect, and such records as I possess are mostly accidental finds. One medical antiquary thinks that there must have been surgeons in country villages from the earliest times. In fact he goes so far as to trace them back to the Roman army surgeons, which is going very far back indeed. But judging from the names which I have been able to discover, village practitioners were few and far between even in the seventeenth century.

The poorer classes were always more or less dependent on amateur surgeons, some of whom belonged to the higher classes of society according to Dr William Bulleyn, a celebrated English physician of the sixteenth century, who was born in the Isle of Ely, although he did not practise there. His writings make him the most interesting doctor of that time. He tells us that many country gentlemen and women had divers medicines with which they helped those who could not spend money in surgery, and he particularly mentions his relative "Sir Phillip Paris, of Cambridgeshire, whose cures," he says, "deserve praise." Now Sir Phillip lived at Linton, and the earliest country surgeon I have met with also lived at Linton. I met him in the muniment room at Ely, quite accidentally, under the following circumstances. A woman of Little Wilbraham



was indicted before the Bishop's Court in August, 1581, for incontinency and contingent offences. She wished to call as a witness her doctor Richard Widdows, of Bridge Street, Cambridge. He was asked to appear at 8 a.m. on September 9. He did not come, and although summoned three times, he never appeared. Either Dr Widdows had scruples about divulging professional secrets, even in the Spiritual Court, or did not want to be cross-examined, or Mrs Horner hadn't paid her bill—any way he would not give evidence. So Mrs Horner had to get another witness, and she chose her husband's doctor, Mr John Stacey, a surgeon of Linton. He boldly came forward in the following January and gave evidence in support of the woman's case. His evidence is of too technical a character to be understood by the public, but my opinion is, that Widdows was the wiser man of the two, certainly as regards worldly wisdom. It was of course the usual difference between the simple country and the wary town practitioner. But although I must decry the worldly, if not the professional wisdom of Mr Stacey, I have nevertheless tried to find out something about him, and was pleased to find that he was at one time a trusted member of Sir Phillip Paris's household. Sir Phillip in his will, proved in the first year of Queen Elizabeth, left to John Stacey the keeping of his house in Linton during the nonnage of his son Robert. Stacey was to have a chamber near the hall, an annuity of £1 a year for fifteen years, and as much fruit and vegetables as he required from the orchard and garden. This post had previously been held by a priest, so it was a trust of considerable importance. Young Robert Paris died before Stacey's annuity ceased, but Stacey had meantime bought a house of his own, in which he now set up as a surgeon. Whether he had a proper licence or not I cannot say, nor where he learnt his surgery, unless it was from that successful amateur surgeon, his late master Sir Phillip. However that may be, he seems to have flourished, as in 1592 he paid the fifth highest amount of taxes in Linton. He died in 1596 and was buried in the church there<sup>1</sup>.

<sup>1</sup> Here I may as well record what I have found out about Mr Widdows. He lived in St Clement's Parish, Cambridge, and died in 1588. His store of

I have lately seen a sixteenth century manuscript book of recipes which once belonged to the lord of the manor of Barham in Linton. And it is possible to connect that book with Stacey. The only name written in that book is George Willowes, and John Stacey's next door neighbour, as shown by a contemporary map, was John Willowes. It is possible that Stacey gave the book to Willowes, and from him it somehow got to Barham. But whether connected with Stacey or not, it is at least a Cambridgeshire book of recipes, and deserves a few words.

A large proportion of the recipes deal with remedies for boils, or fellows, as they are called here. One remedy is for the disease called the "New disease." The same complaint fell on the public as a New disease about twenty years ago—Influenza. This remedy was rather a pleasant one, being a mixture of mulled sack and malmsey wine.

Another remedy is to cause a man

"To eschewe dronkinnes and vomiting  
& to avoyd wicked drinkes & meates

Take bettany & dry it and make a powder thereof & use it every daye fastinge in a little stale ale."

Enough to frighten away a man's appetite for a month.

The following is

"A medicyne for the goute

Take black sope & the yolkes of egges, & stir them together

drugs was simple. Litharge of gold, which was yellow oxide of lead, a paper of frankincense, a pot of honey, boar's grease and deer's suet. Altogether his professional outfit, including a brazen pestle and mortar, did not exceed 7s. His apparel included a freeze mandilion, a blew cote, three pair of breeches and a pair of patens. He ate his meals off pewter and used a latten candlestick when he went to bed. His library of general literature consisted of five volumes. A bible with three clasps, by far his most valuable book, a book called *The Benefit of Christ's death*, a mixture of fact and fiction called *The green forrest, or a collection of Historyes no less profitable than pleasant and necessary, doone out of French into English*, published in 1571, a kind of Dictionary of Quotations called *A Variety of Sentences*, and an English translation of Petrarch's *Physic against Fortune*. His medical books will be mentioned later. Mr Widows was evidently a believer in luck, for in his surgery he had four old horse-shoes.



unto a salve and make a plaister thereof & laye it to the sore place & w<sup>th</sup>in six howers yt will cease aking."

Six hours seems a long time to look forward to when one has acute gout in the toe.

In connection with a fellow or boil this remedy is given :

"A salve to close up the wounde  
after ye coore is droune out of it

Take one poun of may butter & half a pound of wax & seathe them on the fyer and treye them well, then take a handful of planten & as mucche rybworte, ij handfull of valerian, half a handful of brookelime, as much smalledge, a good handfull of orpine, a handful of tutstone, as much sinkfoyle, half a handful of grounde ivey, & a handfull of green elder flowers, cut them small & seathe all these in the waxe and maye butter, then strayne them & put them in dishes or make it in cakes."

May butter is highly clarified butter, very pale in colour. The mention of ribwort and plantain shows a nice appreciation of differences between members of the genus *Plantago*.

One of the strangest recipes is this :

"Take glow wormes and being covered with hors dung in a certaine time they will desolve, wich being mixt with a like proportion of quicksilver first clensed, which will be in sixe times washing in vinegar mixt with bay salt, which after everie washing and rubbing must be cast away and then hote watter put to the quicksilver and washed, and then [the glow-worms and quicksilver] inclosed in a pure glass [the product] will give as much light in the dark as the moon."

Glow-worms are very common at Linton still, but I have not tried this recipe.

But to return to country doctors. At the present day my district as a parish doctor contains about twenty-five square miles, with a population of 4400, and my nearest colleague is four miles distant. In dirty snowy weather the work sometimes seems hard. But the seventeenth century surgeons must have had a much harder time of it in this part of the country. Mr Ambrose of Ickleton, Mr Ady of Shudy Camps, and Mr Alington of Brinkley were at least eight miles from each

other as the crow flies, and each of them considerably more from Cambridge. So each man had to rely on his own knowledge and resources.

These doctors of the year 1640 are mere names to us; but towards the end of the century it is possible to obtain some more details about them. The records of the Probate Courts at Peterboro' offer a comparatively easy field to search, and from thence I have obtained much of my material, including the will and inventory of Mr John Longworthy, a practitioner in physic and surgery, who died at West Wratting in 1685. West Wratting was then, as now, a small country village. It is a peculiarly shaped parish, about six miles long, and in places less than a mile broad, stretching from the highlands on the county boundary to the Icknield Way, and having the Fleam Dyke for part of its S.W. boundary. In 1685 it contained about 67 houses, which on an average of four to a house means a population of 270. The house in Wratting Park, which was not so big then as it is now, was occupied by a Mr Lloyd, and there were four other houses of the size of Longworthy's<sup>1</sup>. The village is on one of the main roads from Colchester to Cambridge, and does not seem to offer much scope for a resident doctor. And from an entry in the parish records it seems that Longworthy went as far as Linton, six miles away, for his patients. In 1684 the overseers there paid him £5 for curing a man of the dropsy.

And now at the expense of seeming a little tedious I should like to describe in some detail this country doctor's house and premises as they were when he died. The house consisted of hall, great and little parlours, closet for drugs and surgical instruments, kitchen, pantry and cellar, with five bedrooms and a garret which was used as a granary. A building with two gables and a connecting hall, such as still exist in this county, would fit this description.

On entering the hall you would have seen two gate-legged tables, five joined stools, a grandfather's clock, and a corner cupboard. The hearth contained a fire-grate, but the floor was carpetless. In the little parlour was an oval table and six

<sup>1</sup> Hearth Tax Roll.



painted chairs. No carpet and an open hearth. In the great parlour was the only carpet in the house; an oval table, probably of walnut, six leather and two panelled chairs, and an open hearth with large cobirons. As regards the bedrooms, the hall chamber and the great parlour chamber contained fire-places, which were also open hearths. In the former was a four-poster bed, a carved oak hutch, three chairs and a pair of bellows. In the great parlour bedroom, evidently the best bedroom, was another four-poster with curtains, a chest of drawers and a looking-glass, altogether valued at £10, the most expensively furnished room in the house. The other bedrooms were meanly furnished and without fire-places. One of them is called the manservant's room, so the doctor's groom slept in the house.

In the kitchen was a table, with four chairs and a screen. The value, including roasting apparatus, brass and pewter, was £6. 10s. The only eating utensils mentioned besides this pewter, are a case of knives in the pantry and some earthenware.

We next come to his linen, always a valuable item. He had twelve pairs of sheets, that is, two pairs for each bed and two pairs over. And these were sheets which did not wear out and were often bequeathed in wills. He had five dozen table napkins, which seems an excessive quantity, but the same excess is noted in other cases. It speaks well for the cleanliness of the old surgeons that they had such ample stores of linen. Often it was the most valuable item in the household. Thus the linen of a married surgeon in 1577 was worth a quarter of his whole estate, and more than a third of a barber-surgeon's estate in 1604. Dr Collins, a Regius Professor of Physic, had 35 pairs of sheets, 33 table-cloths, 67 towels, 96 diaper napkins, and 150 napkins of other sorts. A Cambridge apothecary in 1605 had  $12\frac{1}{2}$  doz. napkins; another of Ely had  $5\frac{1}{2}$  doz. There must have been some reason for this large number of napkins, they must have been used, not laid up in lavender. This was before the popularity of the fork as an eating utensil, when the fingers were used in eating, and after each course the salver and a clean napkin were handed to each guest. Dr John Francis, of

Cambridge, in 1665, had a very small amount of linen, but he had a bathing tub, the only one I have seen mentioned, and a wild cat skin mantle<sup>1</sup>.

As we should expect, Mr Longworthy's drink was beer. In his cellar were four half-hogsheads and smaller barrels. And as there was a cider press in his brewhouse, whenever there was a crop of apples, beer was varied with cider.

Last of all comes his professional apparatus, which in the inventory is summed up very briefly. "His instruments and utensils for physic and chirurgery, two stills, one mortar, and a few old books £4," exactly the same value as his linen. His possession of stills shows that he must have distilled his own rose-water, treacle-water, and other such compounds. Doubtless he spent many hours grinding dried roots to powder in his mortar, with one eye and ear on the bubbling of the fluid in his still. A man who spent hours in the preparation of his physic had more faith in it than some have nowadays.

The most valuable part of this surgeon's goods was neither domestic nor professional. He was a small farmer, and his agricultural goods amounted to £65, out of a total of £121. Thus he had five cows, two nags, with bullocks, hogs, and poultry. In his granary, which was the house garret, were two and a half loads of wheat.

Longworthy is the only purely village practitioner of whose property anything is known, but three apothecaries of Ely and March add a few items of interest. Henry Crofts, who died at Ely in 1694, had a small house nicely furnished, including nearly 40 oz. of silver. Three gotches, a Japanese box, and a side-board cloth of calico are unusual items, as are casks of brandy and tobacco. In his summer-house he had a guardian glass, whatever that is. Thomas Marshall, of March, had a watch, a silver taster and a runlet of gooseberry wine, as well as a parcel of barley in his barn for October brewing. Henry Morley, who

<sup>1</sup> As details of unusual publication I append the following extracts from the account of his executrix :

" For rosemary, bran, sedge			4 <sup>s</sup>
Mr W <sup>m</sup> Wells for wine at the funeral	2 <sup>l</sup>	7 <sup>s</sup>	4
Mr Finch for confectionary	2	5	7
Mr Sam Moody for ribbons gloves &c.	10	0	0"



died at Ely in 1735, is the latest. Each item is priced in his inventory. The grandfather's clock in the hall is valued at £4, and the china in his parlour at £2. The odd thing about his house is that none of his bedrooms contained washstands. Each had bed, dressing-glass, chairs, and a chest of drawers or a table, but no washstand.

#### IV. THE DRUGS USED.

When giving an account of Mr Longworthy's establishment I was unable to include an account of his drugs, as they were valued in a lump. And it is the same with most other inventories<sup>1</sup>. However, the men who appraised the stock in trade of Henry Hayes, a surgeon of Wisbech, in the year 1702, have been kinder to us, and owing to their detailed list, we know what drugs a country surgeon used two centuries ago<sup>2</sup>. Their variety, both vegetable and mineral, is astonishing. There were drugs to produce pain, such as colocynth and jalap, and others to mitigate those pains, such as coriander and cardamoms. Quassia and *lignum vitæ*, or *guaiacum* served as bitters. He had no Peruvian bark, but he had half a pound of Winter's bark from the Straits of Magellan. Aromatics were well represented by *olibanum*, *frankincense*, *elemi*, and balm of Gilead. All these were in great repute then, but they are not many of them used much now. He had an ounce of opium, and a pound of manna, the latter being as excellent a remedy for babies of the Augustan age of English literature as it is for babies of to-day. Of vegetable plasters, there were two, *oxycroceum*, a brown plaster containing saffron and vinegar, and *mellilot* plaster, of a green colour, made from a plant still growing wild in this county, and pennyworths of which are yet sold by chemists.

Mr Hayes had various aromatic oils, essential oils, as we should call them now. Of oil of cinnamon he had half a teaspoonful. This must have been a very scarce drug, as even now, if bought by the pint, a teaspoonful would cost 6*d*.

<sup>1</sup> Bottles, gallipots, syrup jars are often mentioned, but not their contents.

<sup>2</sup> Inventories of Consistory Courts of Ely.

Turning to minerals, we find that Hayes must have been a disciple of Paracelsus, as antimony and mercury are well represented by crocus of antimony, now used only in veterinary medicine, quicksilver, calomel, corrosive sublimate, and red precipitate or oxide of mercury. Of lead in the metallic state he had two stone, as well as various quantities of red and white lead and gold litharge. Zinc and copper were also represented, and he had seven pounds of metallic iron.

We now come to drugs from the animal kingdom. Of English castor, a drug obtained from the beaver, he had an ounce. I doubt if it was really from the English beaver, as that animal must have been extinct then. "Castor," says one of Hayes's contemporaries, "is ranked among the antispasmodics; it is of a saponacious nature, so does not act by its stimulus alone, but is resolvent and detergent, &c., &c." American castor is still quoted in wholesale drug lists at 10s. an ounce. According to old writers, the worst castor came from New England.

Of musk, obtained from a deer in Tibet, Hayes had half a drachm. Because of the distant and inaccessible region from whence it came, you would expect this to be an expensive drug. At the present day half a drachm would be worth about ten shillings, but must have been much less valuable then. As it has been recommended to be given in half-drachm doses, it can obviously never have been a popular drug. It was given for hysteria, or the vapours. An old writer says, "When musk occasions hysteric symptoms by its smell, then fetids applied to the nose soon afford relief." Of civet, a similar substance to musk, obtained from Brazil, he had a scrap. This is now worth 10s. an ounce, but may have been worth more then. Of crabs' eyes, a stony substance from the crab, he had two ounces, the same quantity of spermaceti, and eight ounces of Spanish "flies," really a beetle, which is used for blistering.

The apothecary of the seventeenth century was as a rule noted for the complicated nature of his compounds, but Mr Hayes was not very extravagant in that way. He had a large quantity of diacodium simplex or syrup of white poppies, and a smaller quantity of diacodium nigrum or syrup of black poppies.



These, unless small quantities of opium were added, must have been feeble narcotics, but they were celebrated medicines. One of his compounds has stood the test of two centuries since his time, and can still be bought in any chemist's shop. Doubtless some of you have taken it on bread and butter when children; that is, lenitive electuary, or confection of senna. His preparation contained decoction of polypody, which is now left out.

His ointments are different from those in use at present. His favourite seems to have been populeon, an ointment made from black poplar buds, which, according to Culpepper, is singularly good for all heat and inflammation in any part of the body, and particularly swageth the pain of gout in the toe, and is much used by women to beautify the hair.

He had no class of preparation corresponding to the tinctures of the present day, but he had two celebrated compounds, one of which is still in use, and that is the elixir exproprietatis, the elixir of property to man, an invention of Paracelsus. This is a very nauseous decoction of aloes, myrrh, and saffron, which, with the addition of liquorice to mitigate its nastiness, is still in use. The other celebrated compound was treacle-water. Treacle, as used here, has no connection with modern treacle. The name of course has only comparatively recently been applied to a product of the sugar-cane. It was originally an antidote for the bites of venomous beasts. There were different kinds of treacles, such as Venice treacle and the treacle of Mithridate. They all contained a large number of ingredients, often as many as fifty, including the flesh of vipers, and their appearance was that of modern treacle. The treacle-water of Mr Hayes was distilled from a mixture of French brandy, vinegar, juice of green walnuts, roots of butterbur and other herbs, together with Mithridate and Venice treacle. It would probably be a pungent, aromatic, dark coloured product, with hardly any medicinal virtues, except those dependent on faith. It had taken infinite trouble to prepare. It was given for fevers.

Such is a brief account of the drugs of the apothecary of two centuries past. A complete list is given in Appendix I. One would have expected from such a good list that he had

rich patients to take, and to pay for, these drugs. And yet we find that the debts owing to him amounted to only 10s., and his purse and apparel are valued at 50s. It looks as if he had been ploughing the sand.

An earlier list of drugs occurs amongst the inventories of the University Court<sup>1</sup>. Thomas Brydon, an apothecary of Cambridge, who died in 1589, left property to the value of £60, of which the drugs amounted to 27s. 10d. The pleasant thing about his list of drugs was that he had no nauseous remedies at all. His chief method of administering medicines was by means of conserves, or confections. Thus he had nine pounds of conserve of barberries, worth 1s. a pound. Barberries were supposed to be good for many ills, but Culpepper says they are especially good to get a man a stomach for his victuals. Conserves of cherries and roses would strike no terror into the minds of children, but must have been used to cover the taste of more nauseous drugs. Angelica, caraways, and cummin seed are also flavouring agents, and when we find "pepper, cloves, cinnamon, prunes, raysons and other spices," valued at a fifth of the total value of his drugs, we must reckon Mr Brydon an elegant pharmacist.

Now we come to his external remedies. With his angelica and caraways are enumerated stavesacre seeds. These were not for flavouring purposes, but for making an ointment. Cambridge school children of the year of the Great Armada harboured uninvited guests in their heads, and this ointment was to kill them. One of his drugs is in common use at present, lapis calaminaris, or calamine powder, a native carbonate of zinc. Red and yellow wax, spermaceti, oil of roses and diachylon plaster are names well known. But two of his drugs I cannot run to earth, oil of exceter<sup>2</sup> and green trett, the latter being apparently an ointment or plaster. The name of one of his ointments puzzled me for a long time, and was the cause of much loss of time over dictionaries and vocabularies. In the

<sup>1</sup> Bundle 5.

<sup>2</sup> This was made by macerating about two dozen different herbs in oil and wine. Dr Quincey says that it was more called for by the common people than in regular prescriptions.



transcript of this inventory, made by the clerk in the Probate Office, occurred an ointment called "Ira dei," "The wrath of God." This could only mean a vigorous blistering ointment, but I could find no confirmatory evidence. Sometime afterwards I was looking through a manuscript which had belonged to the Squire of Barham, and was written about the same time as Brydon's inventory, and there amongst some medical recipes I found one headed "Gratia dei," "The grace of God," gratia being written grã; and I was very pleased on looking at the original inventory myself to find that grã, and not ira, was there written.

The recipe is so quaint, that I will give it in full.

"Emplastrum vocatur grã dei

This plaister is called the grace of god for that his angell brought it frō heaven to King Alexsander for the people of his land when they were all near lost with deadly woundes by spear dart and dagger and with many other malladyes, as the surgeons have longe since fayned, I would saye avowed. Take the juyce of bettany, the juce of vervayne & of pimpernell of eche one ponde, & take a pound & half of waxe rosen, & half a pounce of pery rozen, iij ounces frankconcense on ounce & smalle powder of collophonye, halfe a pounce & hal a pound (*sic*) of the wettest of sheepes sewit, A pinte of sweat bascard<sup>1</sup> and boyle them together in a panne over the fyer, till it be some what thicke. & take it from the fyer & clense it fayer through a clothe and set it over the fyer agayne & put therto iij ounces of oyle, and all the powder aforesayd, & so boyle it softlye the space of thryse sayinge the lordes prayer, and take it and cast it in a charger till it be could, & then take it owght & cut it leaches & rowle it into roubles & keep them in a leather or parchment for it is good."

This recipe interested me particularly because it was written in that book in the village where I now practise, and may be in the writing of an early predecessor of mine there. Both water betony and wood betony, and vervain, once so celebrated as remedies, are now forgotten, although they still grow in the

<sup>1</sup> Spanish wine.

woods and ditches of Linton. Everyone knows the scarlet pimpernel, but who would care to collect enough to make a pound of juice? The space of time which the compound was to boil, "space of saying the Lord's prayer thrice," must of course vary according to whether the compounder was a quick talker or a stutterer. The finished product would probably be something like basilicon ointment, a drawing ointment, and suitable for the festering wounds of King Alexander's army.

Dr Brydon's shop furniture was as follows:

Two nests of boxes, containing boxes & the seed in them 5s., thirty-two gallipots 5s., twenty-five great boxes 4s., thirty-six glasses 3s., seven oyle potts 2s., eight rounde standing boxes & thirty-four boxes 2s., four brazen mortars weighing 9 score & ten pounds at 3*d.*, £2. 6s. 0*d.*, four pestles weighing 20 lb. 3s. 4*d.*, a marble mortar & a marble grynding stone & a muller 3s. 4*d.*, seven pairs of scales, three half hundred weights of lead & nineteen pounds of brazen weights £1.16s., one bowstringe 4*d.*, one hanging candlestick 1s., two old great counters and two settles 13s. 4*d.*; seven great standing pots 4s., two dialls, a box, a sheaf of arrows & other trifles, two styllatories 6s. 8*d.*, lead, & a styllatorye of lead 20s.

In the study were a table, oulde books, ould keys & other trash 2s. 6*d.* In the Hall an oulde bible & service book 1s. 8*d.* His clothes were worth £3, his linen £5.

## V. CAMBRIDGE DOCTORS.

*Walter Lemster, Physician (?1440)–1487.*

An early Cambridge physician who became eminent and fashionable in his profession was Walter Lemster, who took the degree of Bachelor of Medicine in 1466<sup>1</sup>, became a Fellow of King's and the leading practitioner in the town. Amongst his patients was the Bishop of Ely. When that Bishop was taken ill in May, 1477, in order to be certain of his attendance, he had settled on the doctor an annuity of 10 marks a year, to be paid out of the manor of Fen Ditton. In the following April, the

<sup>1</sup> Grace Book A, p. 64.



Bishop's health having become worse, and more attention from the doctor required, the pension was increased to one of 20 marks for life. The Bishop was then living in his palace at Downham, which is nearly twenty miles from Cambridge, too long a journey to take every day in bad weather. So the grant of the pension contained stipulations about the doctor's entertainment, or *Bouche de Court*, as it is called. This was to be provided, for the doctor himself, for two servants and three horses, as often as he should visit the Bishop. This stipulation shows that the doctor travelled about attended by two mounted servants, rather a lordly method.

But in spite of Dr Lemster's skill the Bishop died in the following August, and the doctor had his pension of what was equal to £130 of our money for life, and there are records to show that it was really paid<sup>1</sup>.

Dr Lemster was still living at Cambridge in 1480, but sometime after that date he removed to London, and when Henry Tudor became King, Lemster was appointed his physician. It is possible of course that the King had met the doctor at Cambridge, whither he sometimes came with his mother about her college foundations, and had invited him to come to London. In 1484 he received a grant of a pension of £40 for life from the King<sup>2</sup>, which, with his other pensions, gave him a comfortable income. For besides those already mentioned, in 1483 occurs the record of a pension of 10 marks being granted to Lemster and his wife Katherine by the Duke of Norfolk<sup>3</sup>. But he did not enjoy his pensions many years, for he died in 1487, and was buried in S. Antony's Church, London<sup>4</sup>. He could not have been a very old man, as it was only twenty-one years since he took his degree.

From this short account it will be seen that his career was a successful one. Still Dr Lemster had his troubles, and a piquant and interesting episode in his life was when he appeared before the Court of Chancery as a suitor. In the year 1470, whilst he was still living at Cambridge, a fellow don named

<sup>1</sup> Bentham's *Ely*, p. 178, App. No. 34, Suppl. p. 96.

<sup>2</sup> Patent Roll.

<sup>3</sup> Harleian MSS. 433, Art. 1751.

<sup>4</sup> Weaver, *Funeral Monuments*.

Richard Narborough<sup>1</sup>, a doctor of civil law, met at his house a lady named Lucy Brampston, whom the doctor calls his daughter-in-law. Richard and Lucy became betrothed, or, as the record puts it, "Richard affied Lucy to have her for wife, and Lucy likewise." Soon after the betrothal Narborough went to Padua to study law, where it was understood between them he was to stay for two years, after which time he was to come home and marry Lucy according to the law of holy church. Meantime he asked Dr Lemster to lodge his betrothed and her maid, to feed and clothe them, and then when he came home from beyond the seas he would repay him. So Mistress Lucy and her maid dwelt with the doctor at Cambridge, waiting for her betrothed's return. The two years went by and no Richard appeared and no communication from him either. Dr Lemster began to get uneasy, and hearing that the Archdeacon of Norfolk was going to Rome, he asked him to make enquiries at Padua. The only news which the Archdeacon could send was that Narborough was no longer at Padua, but was supposed to have gone to Louvain. Edmund Wright, another Cambridge doctor of law, made ineffectual enquiries there, except that he was traced to Bruges and Ghent. At length after ten years Narborough returned, but not to Cambridge. However, at his special desire Mistress Lucy went to London to see him. The poor lady had worried herself into a long illness and had probably lost her good looks. Any way Narborough refused to marry her, and what was worse for the doctor, refused to pay him his out-of-pocket expenses.

To invoke the aid of the law was ever a costly matter, but Lemster was a prominent man, as we have seen, with an assured income. So he filed a petition to the Chancellor to compel Narborough to marry Lucy and to pay his costs. This petition is the source of the foregoing account. It quaintly declares that not only has the conduct of Richard been to the great heaviness and hurt of the petitioner, but it has also been to the great peril and jeopardy of the soul of the said Master Richard.

<sup>1</sup> Grace Book A, p. 75.



Attached to the petition is a schedule of the doctor's expenses, of which, as it is a curiosity of rare occurrence, a transcript is here given.

Imprimis for bedde & boorde for lucy & hir mayden by the space of x yere by his agrement and special desire paying by y <sup>e</sup> weke iij <sup>s</sup> iiij <sup>d</sup> for them twayne	}	<sup>1</sup> cxxx marks
Item for hir arayment yerely delyvered to hir to by gownys, kirtells, smokks, etc	}	xx <sup>li</sup>
Item for arayment of hir servande yerely delyvered xiiij <sup>s</sup> iiij <sup>d</sup>	}	x mark
Item for necessary expenses made uppon her in tyme of hir sore and gret sekenes, caused thruh his unkyndenes & changeablenes, ful hard to escape with lyeffe as al the cuntrey knoweth wel, & as yet apperith on hir for ever sith she hath ben sekele thruh sorowe & pensyffenes which she toke for his newfangles	}	xiiij <sup>li</sup> xiiij <sup>s</sup> iiij <sup>d</sup>
Item for diverse expensis made over see to seke hym at Loven, at Bruges & gaunt & at paddua, sumtyme by ye archdeacon of North- folke, & by Mayster Edmund Wright, Doctor of Lawe & diverse other marchandis at many tymes to my gret trowble & charge as it apperith more at large by billys proof made	}	xl <sup>li</sup>
Item for necessarie costis & charges doon and made at this last tyme yn the mayr of london is court & the sherriff etc, and yn condyting the seyde Lucy from Cambrige to London at his special desir to speke w <sup>t</sup> hym ther abidyng & taryng for remedy of hir gret wrong by the space of iij wekys	}	xlviiij <sup>s</sup> x <sup>d</sup>
Item for myn interest and grevous trowble in al the tyme & space of the said x yer whiche as god knowyth yef y myght a chosen y wolde not a suffird for the wynyng of ccc <sup>li</sup> & mor, I Remit to yo <sup>r</sup> noble wisdom <sup>e</sup> <sup>2</sup> .		

<sup>1</sup> £86. 13s. 4d.

<sup>2</sup> Early Chancery Proceedings, Bdle 61, No. 584.

The total amount claimed was £470, or at least £4000 of our money. I should rather doubt if Lemster expected to recover so much. The damages claimed for the grievous trouble to which he had been put, namely £300, are very large, considering the value of the damage to Mistress Lucy's broken heart, which is assessed at only £13. 13s. 4d. If he lost the day the Doctor of Law would certainly be ruined. He would get off most cheaply by marrying the lady. Perhaps he did so, and no more was heard about the case.

*John Thomas, Surgeon (? 1490)–1545.*

John Thomas took his B.A. degree in 1512, and in 1514 obtained from the university a licence to practise surgery<sup>1</sup>. He practised in Cambridge for over thirty years, during one of the most momentous periods of her history, but no reference to him is met with until his death. He died in the late summer of 1545, without having made a will, and letters of administration were taken out by John Pratt, an apothecary. An elaborate inventory of his household goods was made by the university appraisers, and from this it would be possible to construct some sort of a picture of the habits and surroundings of a Cambridge surgeon of the Pre-Reformation date.

His house was one of three storeys, and stood in a row with smaller houses. To this original house, as his family and possessions increased, the surgeon had added two of the smaller houses, one on either side of it, each consisting of a shop, with a cellar beneath and a chamber above. The house as enlarged contained eight rooms, including the surgeon's shop and two cellars. In 1545 only three of the rooms were properly furnished, the hall, the shop, and the chamber over it. This may be accounted for by the supposition that the surgeon died a widower, and that his children had died or married and left him. Perhaps his only daughter had married John Pratt.

The furniture of these three rooms, as enumerated in the inventory, seems to be chiefly remarkable for its lack of comfort. Take for instance the hall, which was dining-room and kitchen

<sup>1</sup> Grace Book B, Part II. pp. 6 and 29.



combined. Over the walls were two old pieces of tapestry, valued only at 4*d.*, there was no carpet on the stone floor, which was probably covered with rushes in winter, and perhaps in August, 1545, with the sweet flag (*acorus calamus*), which then grew at the college backs. A table on a foot could not have been a very large one, but probably quite large enough for the two joyned stools, and an easy chair of wainscot, which completed the dining furniture. In one corner was a cupboard with four locks, and in another a locked chest with a pair of playing tables on it. This latter I take to be a backgammon board. On the open hearth were andirons or dogs for supporting logs of wood, and cooking apparatus in sparing quantity. In the chimney above hung three bags, containing salt and oatmeal. Probably the hams cured last autumn had all been eaten. On the mantel-piece were a quart pewter pot, two pint pots, a half-pint pot, a stone pot with a cover, a pepper quern and a salt box. A pair of bellows hung by the side of the hearth. Various platters great and small are enumerated, but no dresser on which they could be displayed. I think however that wooden trenchers were used in this household, as there were two dozen of them besides wooden dishes. Two articles are mentioned together which seem at first sight ill-assorted, a battledore and a rolling-pin value 2*d.*, but a battledore at this period was a washing-beetle, not for playing with a shuttlecock.

In the chamber over the shop, which seems to have been the largest room in the house, and was the surgeon's bedroom, as it was the only room with a bed, were gathered together many things from other parts of the house, yet of bedroom furniture there was little, save the bedding, which consisted of mattress, feather bed, sheets, blankets, bolster and pillows, a three-footed buffet stool, two four-footed stools, two chests with locks and keys, and a feather cushion. That is all.

In the surgeon's shop was another buffet stool, an old wainscot chair, a turned chair, a round table, and a red-backed cushion. In the whole inventory, which comprises nearly five hundred items, there are no more chairs or stools than are mentioned in these three rooms.

As regards the surgeon's shop, the professional part of it can soon be enumerated in detail. First there was a window frame of canvas, from which I conclude that the shop window was usually open to the street, and only closed on special occasions to insure privacy. The chemical apparatus consisted of one latten and two brazen mortars, a little melting pan, a pile of Troy weights, a hair sieve, a chaffer with a lid, and two things of pewter to box salve with. The greater part of the drugs are lumped together—"bottles, pots, salves, boxes and other trash," value 6s. 8*d.* But a few are mentioned by name. A bottle of alegar, valued at 2*d.* It is curious to find this article had any value at all, as it is simply sour beer. Perhaps 2*d.* was the value of the bottle containing it. A pot of may butter, that is, butter which has been several times melted, is of a very pale colour, and goes rancid slowly; small quantities of alum, wax and rosin; a sheep skin for plasters, four pounds of flare for ointments; fourteen pounds of iron in slips, evidently for medicinal purposes, to make steel wine, &c., complete the list. The value of this iron was five shillings, a little over fourpence a pound. In a little casket and in a coffer with locks, were kept the surgeon's most precious drugs. At present they were out of stock. His surgical instruments are not very formidable, nor is their enumeration enlightening: e.g. ten old tools 6*d.*, five little tools for teeth 2*d.*, a leather bag with tools and boxes 12*d.* Out of a total of £31, his stock in trade was worth only £2.

The greater part of the five hundred items is made up of personal or household clothes, which also constitute the articles of most value. Nothing seems to have been too trivial to take note of: e.g. a rusty knife 2*d.*, an old hamper 1*d.*, a salt box  $\frac{1}{2}$ *d.* There were very few portable pieces of furniture, a painted coffer with lock and key, and a great chest are once mentioned, being valued at 16*d.* each. Dr Thomas did not leave a well-stocked larder, for no single article of food is mentioned. In one of the cellars was a poundsworth of charcoal, and in the attics a shillingsworth of sea coal. In the yard was a select feathered family consisting of a cock, two hens and three chickens. Our surgeon was in the habit of making his own



feather beds, for amongst the items is a bag of feathers valued at 3*d.*

He was so well stocked with some articles, that the number will surprise you. For instance he had sixteen metal candlesticks, which were kept on the stairhead; one of these is described as having a prick, as if that was unusual. Then he had sixteen pairs of sheets, whereas he had only two bedsteads. But most remarkable of all, are his twenty-five shirts in various stages of wear. This brings me to a prominent characteristic of the man, that he hoarded up all his cast-off clothing, and even those of his dead wife as well. The appraiser's description of some of the latter may amuse you.

Item a kirtell of scarlet in pieces all eaten with moths	3 <i>s.</i> 4 <i>d.</i>
Item a kirtell of worstede eaten with rats	... .. 2 <i>s.</i> 8 <i>d.</i>
Item a gown of blue likewise eaten	... .. 3 <i>s.</i> 4 <i>d.</i>
Item a gown of murrey, shamefully eaten	... .. 3 <i>s.</i> 4 <i>d.</i>

From the description you would think that these garments were in rags, and yet they are valued at more than his medical books. Galen's *De Elementis* is valued at a shilling, and Vigo's *Surgery* at 8*d.*, but the gown of murrey, shamefully eaten, at 3*s.* 4*d.* Some of his wife's clothes are more respectfully described, such as a red kirtell in a linen bag, value 4*s.*, a scarlet peticote 2*s.*, a woman's gown of murry lipped 5*s.*

Amongst the kitchen utensils was a pair of women's sleeves, probably to be worn as the twentieth century housewife wears white sleeves when she does a bit of cooking.

When we consider the surgeon's own clothes, those which he had recently worn and those which he had worn thirty years before, it becomes easy to understand why he had twenty-five shirts. He had kept all his old ones. And he had done the same with his academic costume, which is an epitome of his life.

A surpless in a linen bag  
 A bachelor's habit & hood  
 A scholar's gown  
 A Master of Arts hood  
 A priest's cap.

The scholar's gown was worth more than all the others put together.

The list of his clothes includes doublets, coats, jackets, gowns, gaberdynes, and cloaks, of varying colours and values, but says very little about his hose. A doublet of white fustian tied to his hose, a pair of which in the hall are valued at 8*d.*, is once mentioned. But the elegance of his upper garments made up for the poorness of his hose. He could cut a really fine figure when out walking. In the summer he would wear his doublet of satin, with a velvet girdle and purse round his waist, and his hat with red ribbons. If it rained he would put on his gaberdyne of tawney chamlet faced with coney, and perhaps his sarcenet tippet. For the winter he had a red buttoned cap and several leather jerkyngs and jackets, particularly a jacket of tawney chamlet frockwise, and a sarcenet neckerchief; in rough weather he could choose between his violet gown faced with fitches 13*s.* 4*d.*, his gown trimmed with fox 13*s.* 4*d.*, or his long gown with a hood faced with chamlet 20*s.* One of the clothing items is this: "A cloke of the nue color 2*s.* 4*d.*" So he evidently kept up with the fashion. What the new colour was three hundred years ago it would be difficult now to determine. Boots are like hose, a very small item in the list, but a shoeing horn and three pairs of spurs are valued at 2*d.* The latter must have been like his wife's clothing, a reminiscence, for he had neither horse nor harness when he died. Some of his clothes were hanging in the shop, a satin doublet, a hood lined with mockado chamlet, and a sarcenet tippet. These may have been his every-day clothes, and those which he last wore when he sallied forth on his rounds with his leather bag of tools.

Just a little can be surmised concerning the sports and pastimes of this surgeon. The possession of a hanger and a dagger shows that the sport of fighting was not unknown to him. He also had a sword with two edges, a broadsword, such as we associate with northern parts. Perhaps he had done a bit of soldiering in his youth, had slain a Scotchman on Flodden Field, and brought back his broadsword as a trophy. But he used gentler sports also: a bugle horn may have been for



hunting. A net and lines and several hoop nets show him a fisherman. And as for a quail net and pipe, it is quite plain what they were for. The surgeon was in the habit of repairing to Swinecroft, there to practise the gentle art of inveigling the toothsome quail into his net.

He had a good library, considering that he was a surgeon, and thus not supposed to be learned, but to occupy a much inferior position. He had ninety-one works, the titles of fifty-eight being given, eleven of them being medical. These will be noticed later. The classical authors read by Thomas were Ausonius, Aulus Gellius, Caesar, Cicero, Horace, Politian, Sallust and Virgil. No Greek author, you will notice, which makes me suspect that his Galen and Aristotle were in Latin. But he had Greek and Hebrew grammars and several copies of the Lexicon of Calepinus. Devotional books are represented by the New Testament in Latin, a psalter, a missal of the smaller volume, and the Golden Legend in Latin and French. From the astronomy of Guido de Cauliaco, he learnt when was the proper time to bleed his patients. Of modern literature he had little. No book in English is mentioned. A French book without clasps or strings had been sold for 8*d*. The works of the Italian historian Sabellicus, the Latin Comedy of Acolastus and the Epistles of Francis Niger were all he had to amuse himself with<sup>1</sup>.

*Robert Pickering, Physician.*

Robert Pickering, a contemporary of Thomas, kept a much more orderly house than the surgeon. The effects of the latter were scattered in a higgledy-piggledy fashion over many rooms. The physician had a smaller house, but it was more orderly arranged. But the physician had a wife to keep his house in order, the surgeon only the memory of a wife and her moth-eaten clothes.

Dr Pickering died in the summer of 1551, perhaps of the sweating sickness, which was then raging in Cambridge. In his will he simply describes himself as a scholar, of the town of

<sup>1</sup> A complete list of his books is given in an Appendix, No. II.

Cambridge, and goes on in devout and almost poetical style, "I wyll my body to be placed in the earthe amongst the congregation that be asleep in the lord, & the order of my burial I do refer to them that have the interest of my goods."

The rooms on the ground floor of his house were hall, parlour, kitchen, shop, and pantry. The hall was the main living room. As such, we might not find its furniture very comfortable at the present time, but as an entrance hall, many people would give large sums for the furniture if it could be obtained now. It is at present a fashionable ambition to collect into our halls as many old and often useless pieces of furniture as we can pick up, imagining perhaps that by so doing we are giving ourselves the surroundings of the spacious times of Queen Elizabeth. Now see the furniture of the hall of a Cambridge physician of the year 1551, the year of the great sweat.

You would enter through a portal of wainscot, a kind of double door to keep off the draught. The walls were covered with painted hangings or tapestry, which were as valuable as the rest of the hall furniture. The floor was of polished oak. The length of the room was at right angles to the entrance. In the middle was a table on a frame, nine feet long. At each end of the table was a chair, one with a velvet cushion for the lady. Also at one end was a little joyned chair with a back, and at the other end a little joyned stool with turned feet. Each of these had a cushion, and were evidently for the children. On the opposite side of the table from the door a joined form ran the whole length of the table, and on the side next the door were placed six joyned stools<sup>1</sup>. At one end of the hall was an open hearth, and on the mantelpiece above it a drinking-glass. In a corner cupboard near the hearth was a roasting-jack with two locks and keys. On a nail by the portal hung a clothes brush. The only other piece of furniture was a banker of six yards, this was a covering of tapestry, but I cannot place it. The doors which communicated with the hall led into the doctor's shop and kitchen on one side, and the parlour on the other. The kitchen contained a variety of

<sup>1</sup> Three of which are specified as having corners.



utensils<sup>1</sup> and a pint pot with a bar, the latter perhaps for keeping the doctor's moustache out of his beer. In the buttery, amongst the pewter, were six dishes of the new fashion. These were highly priced at 4s. 4d. Here was also a linen wheel.

The doctor's shop was most creditable to him, though hardly suitable for a physician of to-day. There were two fair counters with locks and keys. It is not clear why counters required locks and keys. The drugs were on twenty-one shelves, which were hung with painted valance, paned yellow and red. The shelves contained nineteen syrup pots, thirty-three great gallipots, twenty pottle glasses, and many smaller glasses or bottles. "Three styll'd waters and their glasses," valued at 10s., were large bottles of waters distilled from rose leaves, dill seed, or other aromatics. Nine dozen phials are priced at 4s. There were no less than nine pairs of scales, and ten ink-pots, the latter number being rather a puzzle. But nine spatulas for making ointments, and a stillatory with a pewter head are usual. The total value of his drugs was about £10, and of his shop fittings £8, altogether a quarter of his personalty. Therefore I said his shop and its contents did him credit. To this section belong the doctor's little nag, valued at £2, and his riding boots, bridle, and saddle, valued at 3s. 4d.

In his shop were some old books being used as waste paper, and valued at 2d. For all we know the doctor had been accustomed to wipe his ointment knives on leaves torn out of Caxtons, now as valuable as bank-notes.

There must have been a staircase somewhere in the house, but the inventory does not name it, so I must take you straight to the chamber above the hall. This was entered through a portal quite as elaborate as that at the hall door. It contained a fair standing bed, with settles about it, and the walls were covered with stained cloth hangings, which were paned yellow and red, with a border. Two of the most interesting items were in this room, hanging on the wall, I suppose. One was "A mappe de peregrinatione Pauli," that is, I suppose, a map of the Mediterranean Sea, showing the wanderings of S. Paul.

<sup>1</sup> Such as skillets, trevets, chafers, gridirons and dripping pans.

The other was "A table of S. Barbara et eccl<sup>1</sup> homo." I can give no explanation of this.

The doctor's clothes were not so numerous as those of John Thomas, but I daresay they were newer and smarter. He had doublets of damask, satin and taffety, one gown of russet guarded with velvet and faced with black coney; another gown was faced with lizard, which must have been very striking; and another with foynes of chamlet, which means, I suppose, slashes of chamlet across the front. This was his most expensive garment, valued at 30s.

I am sorry, for the sake of the ladies, that I cannot give a list of Mrs Pickering's clothes, but they may be interested to know that she rejoiced in the possession of nineteen pairs of sheets, of which eleven pairs were flaxen, the others hempen, total value £6.

In later times it was the custom of Cambridge doctors to collect much gold and silver plate. Dr Pickering had not been very successful in this, as he had only a dozen silver spoons and a gilt salt. But I fear he died young, before he had had time to fill his stocking.

His library consisted of over 200 volumes, most of them in Latin and Greek—only one English title is given. About 145 works are mentioned by name, 43 being medical works. The most valuable item is a copy of the works of Galen in Greek, but his medical works will be considered in a special section. There is no doubt about his knowledge of Greek. His Plato was his most valuable classical work (2 vols. 10s.), next come Cicero (2 vols. 6s.), Thucydides (4s.) and Plinius *in magno* (3s. 4d.). Other authors are Herodotus, Herodian, \*Diodorus Siculus, Plutarch, Socrates, Euripides, Seneca, Plautus, Pindar, Lucian, Suetonius, Martial and Sallust, a goodly list for a medical practitioner. A later work was the *Consolation of Philosophy* of Boethius. There were at least eight works by Erasmus, who must have been his contemporary at Cambridge, including two copies of the *De constribendis epistolis*, valued at 2d. and 10d. This was one of the earliest books printed at Cambridge. The *adagia* of Erasmus in a large volume was the most expensive

<sup>1</sup> Or ea<sup>9</sup>. It is difficult to read this word.



of his works. Luther is represented by one volume, a work on Deuteronomy. Geography and astronomy are represented by the *Tabula* of Ptolemy and the *Imago Mundi* of Peter de Alyacus, printed in 1492, and the *Epitome* of Joachim Vadianus. His devotional books included the Greek and Latin Psalters, a Latin New Testament, and the *Scala Perfectionis*. The possession of a luting book shows that the doctor was a musician. The date of the first luting book in Watt is 1553.

None of the books mentioned yet could be considered light literature. The only work which could possibly come under that heading is a copy of the *Merry tales of Poggio* in Italian, and perhaps the following works may have been looked upon by Pickering as light :

The *Nuge* of Nicholas Bourbon, a Latin poet of France, 1533; *The beauties of the Latin Tongue*, by L. Valla, a very popular work in the sixteenth century; and a Latin version of the *Iliad* by the same author<sup>1</sup>.

### *John Hatcher, M.D. (? 1512)–1587.*

John Hatcher is the first doctor practising in Cambridge who appears to us as living in almost a princely style of magnificence. Probably there is no other town of the size in England, with the exception of Oxford, where so many medical practitioners have been able to amass fortunes. This university town always seems to have attracted doctors with good brains, or with good manners, or perhaps with both. And Dr John is the earliest example. There is a good account of him in Cooper's *Athenae*, II. 7. He took the degree of Doctor of Medicine in 1542, and soon afterwards bought the site on which stood the buildings of the lately suppressed Austin Friary. This covered a large area at the back of Corpus, and was entered by gates from Peas Hill.

He was successful in weathering all the political storms through which he had passed, as other doctors have done, both before and since his time. He probably found it best that his politics should always be those of his patient, an excellent rule

<sup>1</sup> A complete list of his books will be found in the Appendix, No. III.

for both parties. He acquired considerable wealth, and bought other lands in Cambridge and estates in other parts of this county and in Lincolnshire. At the latter part of his life, judging from the contents of his doctor's shop, he gave up practice, and perhaps devoted himself to academic pursuits. For some years he was regius professor of physic, and in 1580 he was Vice-Chancellor of the University, being one of the few Vice-Chancellors who have not been heads of colleges. His name appears in many state papers of this period relating to the University. He died in the spring of 1587, having seen many changes during his residence in Cambridge. Dr Hatcher was twice married. By his first wife he had three children, a son who has a niche in the *Dictionary of National Biography*, although the doctor himself has none, and two daughters, one of whom married another regius professor of physic, about whom I shall have something to say presently. His second marriage took place late in life. In 1582 he married Mistress Jane Freville, a widow of S. Edward's parish. This marriage was not a success. When he made his will less than two years afterwards, he possibly regretted it, and was ready like Mr Weller senior, to enter a caveat against widows. The will states that she had most undutifully stept aside from him, without his consent or knowledge, and his legacy to her of a black gown is only conditional on her wearing it at his funeral.

His considerable wealth is plainly shown by the inventory of his goods taken by the university appraisers in April, 1587<sup>1</sup>. This is the most elaborate document of the kind for that period which I have seen. It consists of seven sheets of paper seven inches broad, stitched end to end and then rolled up. There are seventeen feet of writing, some of it being very small. The valuation is only concerned with his personalty, such as furniture, clothes, books, money, &c., but it amounted to £1466, a large sum for those times. The appraisers charged £12. 4s. 6d. for making the inventory, which is roughly two-thirds per cent., but they complain that Mr Lively had struck off £2 from this amount. Lively was regius professor of Hebrew, and had married one of Hatcher's grand-daughters.

<sup>1</sup> Univ. Inventories, Bdle 1.



It is quite possible that the inventory may deserve being printed in full, but I had time only to glance over it and pick out a few plums.

The house is described room by room, the furniture being enumerated in detail. Besides outhouses, twenty-seven rooms are mentioned, and not only the number, but also the size of these, astonishes one. For instance, the great parlour is described as having a ceiling seventy yards long and nine feet high, and the great chamber above it a ceiling sixty yards long and two yards high. These lengths of ceiling, seventy and sixty yards, refer, I suppose, to the vaulting which ran round the top of the room. Now a parlour of fifty feet square, or seventy-five feet long and thirty broad, and a bedroom not much smaller, are enormous for the private house of a commoner. And there were besides other large rooms in this house. The ceiled parlour was fifty-five yards round, the new parlour was twenty-three yards round, with correspondingly large chambers above. And they all contained tapestry carpets. So Dr Hatcher must have been a good customer for the upholsterers. Some explanation is needed of the size of these rooms, and I think it may be found in the fact that Dr Hatcher's house was built out of the Austin Friary. This had come into his possession within ten years of the dissolution of the Order, and so would not have been entirely dismantled. Hence it is possible that in Dr Hatcher's great parlour and great chamber we may see the refectory and dormitory of the friars. There are several pieces of furniture also which suggest a monastic origin. A long framed table with six turned pillars and eighteen joined stools may have been used by the friars. A branched candlestick of latten may have come from the altar of their church; ten pictures of ages in alabaster, and a picture of Mary Magdalen, must have had an ecclesiastical origin. In the great chamber was a large chest filled with copes and other spoils of churches. In an upper room, to be precise, in the apple chamber, is an item described as "An ancient table of the Priors," valued at 16*d*. Whether this was a piece of furniture, or a list of the priors of the Augustinian Friary of Cambridge, it would be difficult now to decide.

Most of the other rooms had portals or double doors to keep out the draught, including the hall. This contained two settles and several court tables and joined stools; in the chimney was a framed cupboard with two doors, so the chimney must have been as capacious as the rooms. The window curtains were of buckram. The usual pair of playing-table is enumerated.

From this inventory we learn that tapestry or coloured cloth was still the chief ornamentation of the walls. Pictures are almost unknown. In the great parlour was a map of England valued at 4s.<sup>1</sup>, and a map of Baillen<sup>2</sup> valued at 2s. 6d., a calendar in a frame, a framed table of his arms, and a court cupboard with a French panel, which may have been a picture; these are all the items of this character which I could find.

Various items of arms and armour, which would now be exhibited in the hall with great prominence, are here found only in lumber rooms, such as an oaken spear thirteen feet long, a short battle-axe, a black corslet, a head-piece covered with velvet, four jacks for war, or mailed jackets, a caliver and flask, and a halberd staff.

The want of pictures and armour in the hall and other rooms was probably more than made up for by the hangings. For instance, in the new parlour were two great coverings of tapestry<sup>3</sup>, in the great chamber were hangings of checker carol (a mixture of silk and worsted) sixty yards long and six feet deep<sup>4</sup>, as well as another great covering of tapestry, valued at the same amount. In another chamber were hangings of fustian of Naples, and satin of Bruges. The former was an expensive cloth mentioned in sumptuary laws. A man was not allowed to wear fustian anapes unless he was worth over £2 a year.

The enumeration of all the carved joined stools and tables with twined feet, great joined chairs with embroidered backs, &c., &c., mentioned in this inventory, would only raise envious feelings amongst the collectors in the audience, so I will only

<sup>1</sup> ? Wynken de Worde, 1520.

<sup>2</sup> ? Boulogne—Nich. Nichola, 1558.

<sup>3</sup> Valued at £5.

<sup>4</sup> Valued at £3.



mention two articles which were evidently novelties: a little table of walnut tree, valued at 3s., and a chair of walnut with a back of green cloth embroidered, valued at 5s. Most of the other furniture was probably of oak, as the age of walnut had not yet come.

Of all the rooms in this house the great chamber was the most wonderful. Sixty yards round, it had a large oriel window twelve feet broad at one end, cushioned with velvet, and curtained with green and red say. A suitable room for the great bed of Ware. But the bedstead does not seem to have been very large. It was painted, and had a silk quilt worked with the Hatcher arms. It must have been a cold room to sleep in during the damp Cambridge winter, and one is not surprised to find that Dr Hatcher had three warming-pans and a warming-ball of brass. They were wanted in this room, where the souging of the wind behind the sixty yards of checker carol must have given rise to many ghostly noises.

The contents of Dr Hatcher's shop lead me to suppose that he had given up active practice. A counter and several pairs of scales, two hundred weight of lead, a pestle and mortar and a settle do not give one the idea of a busy practice. In another room were two crystal stones. These perhaps were not altogether unconnected with his profession, for this was the age of crystal gazers. John Dee and Hatcher were contemporary fellows of St John's. The only drug mentioned is "cipery" root, of which there were 50 lbs., valued at 26s. 8d. This would be the *cyperus longus*, or galingale, which is not a native of this part of the country. It was used for many complaints, including dropsy. Perhaps Dr Hatcher was trying the galingale cure on himself. But by far the most interesting article in this section was still in the shop, and was valued at half-a-crown. It is called a marble stone to cast manus Christi. A manus Christi was a kind of lozenge, or sweet-meat. So Dr Hatcher made his own lozenges. Perhaps he had a special cough-drop, which he continued to make and sell after he retired from practice.

His collection of gold and silver plate was a fine one. He had about 540 ozs., valued at £140, which works out about 5s. an ounce. I will mention a few of the pieces only.

	£	s.	d.
A bason and ewer, parcel gilt, 24½ oz., [for handing round on special occasions] ... ..	21	0	0
A standing cup with cover, double gilt, 24 oz., [and several others, some of which may have been chalices] ... ..	7	4	0
A standing salt with cover of chase work with D. and G. double gilt, 20 oz....	5	8	0
A beer pot with cover, parcel gilt, 14 oz. ...	3	12	4
A stone cruse with gilt cover and tippe, 3 oz., [perhaps a chrismatory] ... ..	0	16	0
8 spoons with apostle heads, 12 spoons with maydens heads, 30 oz. ... ..	7	5	2
A bason and ewer of silver, for ordinary occasions, 48 oz. ... ..	12	2	6
A standing salt with cover H.V. parcellgilt, 19 oz....	4	18	2
A drinking pot with a cover and two ears double gilt, 15 oz. ... ..	4	0	0

Considering his means, Dr Hatcher was not very extravagant in his dress. He had got beyond the period of his career when his dress was of as much, if not more, importance than his knowledge of medicine. His clothes were certainly more expensive than those of Thomas or Pickering, but the forty years which had passed since their clothes were valued may have made a vast difference in prices. But I notice as before that little account is taken of nether garments. A great variety of cloaks, caps and doublets, but only one pair of galligaskins, or loose trousers, valued at 3s. 4*d.*, and one pair of boot hose, valued at 5s.

Here are some of his more expensive clothes:

	£	s.	d.
A scarlet gown faced with red damask and lined with red baze ... ..	6	13	4
A silk grogram gown guarded with velvet and faced with coney ... ..	4	0	0
A coat of velvet without sleeves, with silk fringes	4	10	0
Two doublets with satin sleeves ... ..	0	10	0
The best round velvet cap was valued at ... ..	0	16	0
A velvet night cap at ... ..	0	3	4



In the kitchen was a noble array of brass and pewter. The cooking utensils were large enough to prepare feasts of a Gargantuan character. Prominent among them were eleven brass pots, which were numbered.

No. 1 was a brass pot with long feet, weighing 37 lbs.

No. 2 was one with shorter feet, „ 40 lbs.

No. 5 was another, supposed to be cracked, „ 30 lbs.

and so on. The eleven weighed altogether over two hundred-weight, and were valued at £4. Two brass kettles weighed 31 lbs. The fire irons and roasting apparatus were very massive. For instance the thirteen spits weighed 144 lbs., four pairs of andirons and a pair of racks 168 lbs., whilst the sea coal irons, a kind of movable grate, weighed 76 lbs.

The plates and dishes used at meals were of pewter. The number of pieces is not mentioned, but their total weight was 519 lbs. Each piece was marked with the owner's initials. The stamp used for marking them is enumerated amongst the lumber. Earthenware is not given in detail, but 12 lbs. of Danish pots are valued at 8s., 37 lbs. of livery pots and ewers at 25s., and 40 lbs. of hard pots at 20s.

The only food of any kind mentioned is a small quantity of salt fish in a safe in the yard.

Amongst the lumber is an article which puzzles me—

“A mathematical salerider of parchment folded, 2*d*.”

It will be supposed that in Dr Hatcher's 16 feet of inventory there was space for many books. And indeed hundreds of titles are given, but they are so crowded, and written in such small characters and with so many abbreviations, that this part of the document is the most difficult to read.

He had a very large and varied classical library and many contemporary works, such as Sir John Cheke's book on Greek Pronunciation, Roger Ascham's *Epistles*, The apology of the Prince of Orange, Micklethwaite's *Catechism for householders* (the earliest edition in Watt is dated some years after Hatcher's death), Becon's *Spiritual and precious Pearl*, and Wilkinson's *Confutation of the Family of Love*. A book called *News of Strange Countries* is valued at 6*d*.

There are many law books in the list, such as Littleton's Tenures, Collections of Statutes, and books on Magna Charta.

As he was connected officially with the University, the theological controversies of the time interested Dr Hatcher. There are several items relating to the dispute between C<sup>r</sup> Cartwright and Whitgift, some of which were printed in Cambridge. A copy of the confession of faith of the Germans, exhibited at Augsburg, and printed in black letter in London, 1556, is valued at 6*d*.

There is a list of over two dozen works which were unbound, including the book on the University by Dr Caius, and Carr's Oration on the scarcity of English writers. This last has rather a pathetic interest in this connection, for it was edited by Dr Hatcher's son Thomas, who died some years before his father.

Before leaving Dr Hatcher, I may mention that the Austin Friary passed soon after his death into the hands of Dr Stephen Perse, and on a part of the site was built the first Perse Grammar School, which gave the name to Free School Lane. And that a part of the refectory, Hatcher's great parlour, was in use in 1789 as a lecture room for the Professor of Botany<sup>1</sup>. A drawing of it by Cole is reproduced in Willis and Clarke's *Architectural History*.

*Thomas Lorkyn, M.D., 1528–1591.*

Thomas Lorkyn, son-in-law of Dr Hatcher, was, like him, regius professor of physic, which position he held for twenty-eight years. He was connected successively with Pembroke, Queens' and Peterhouse, and last of all with Trinity Hall. From a study of his effects when he died, it does not appear that he was in the actual practice of his profession<sup>2</sup>. But he was a prominent member of the faculty of physic in the University. When Queen Elizabeth visited Cambridge in 1564, he was respondent in the physic act kept before her majesty<sup>3</sup>.

<sup>1</sup> Cooper, *Memorials*, III. 283.

<sup>2</sup> University Inventories, Bundle 4.

<sup>3</sup> Cooper, *Annals*, II. p. 196, *Athenae*, II. 102.



He died in 1591, and was buried in Great St Mary's. His furniture was not so valuable as that of his father-in-law, so the valuers paid some attention to smaller articles of furniture, and did not do so much lumping together in lots, as lumber and trash. There was not so much tapestry on his walls, so he covered them with pictures and maps instead. But a map of France is the only one named. There was a frame to wind up a map and an almanac board.

For musical instruments Dr Lorkyn had a lute, a pair of virginals, and two gattornes, whatever they are.

His clothes were not very elaborate. He wore carsey breeches and hose, and grogram upper clothing, neither of which are expensive materials. A cloak of black cloth faced with damask and bone buttons was his most expensive garment, valued at 36s., and he had a rat-coloured cloak, 30s. Amongst various pieces of unmade cloth was "An ell of Lancashire cloth 10d.," bought at Stourbridge fair, I suppose. The most expensive article in cloth work which he possessed was a coverlet of Arras, valued at five marks.

The unusual number of personal effects named in this inventory make it more interesting than many others; e.g. two silk night caps, a purse cloth of gold, several pairs of spectacles, a great spectacle glass with a case 8d., two burning glasses, and a watch of latten gilded, valued at 40s. Dr Lorkyn was rather great on armoury. A ring with his arms is valued at 50s. This was something more than an ordinary gold ring, for another item is, six rings of gold valued at 70s. He also had two seals of bone with his arms, a table of his arms in glass, and a considerable amount of literature on the subject. The next item carries an interesting suggestion with it, "A red staff topped with silver, 2s." This may have been Dr Hatcher's professional stick, corresponding to the gold headed cane of the next century, that is to say, a staff with a hollow silver top containing a sponge saturated with aromatic vinegar, which the doctor held to his nose when he went into a bedroom where sick people were lying with the window shut. But it may have been only a silver topped Malacca cane.

Even toilet articles are not passed over. Such as combs,

comb brushes, ear and tooth picks of silver and bone. Dr Lorkyn had a fair amount of silver, but nothing to compare with his father-in-law. I am sorry to say that his best piece, a gilt cup valued at £5, was in pawn. An article of furniture frequently occurs in these inventories which has disappeared from our rooms, and that is a standish. Lorkyn had two, one with gold weights, and another with a cast of counters, coral beads and dice. Two odd items are, a quadrant of brass 2s. 6*d.*, a skeane with girdle knife and bodkin 3s. 4*d.*

Besides his rooms in Trinity Hall, where he must have slept sometimes, as he had a warming-pan there, he had rooms furnished for living and sleeping at Chesterton Lordship. His occupations at the latter house were fishing and gardening, as may be gathered from two items, an angle rod, and certain pots for a hot house, with planks and shelves, &c. The books which he kept there were not very light. Erasmus, Tully, Virgil, Terence, and Castalio's Dialogues. Several books which were in his college chambers would be more in place here, such as Tusser's *Five hundred points of good husbandry*, a book on Surveying, Turberville's *Book of Hawking*, and *The Art of Riding*, by John Astley.

Dr Lorkyn's library is a great contrast to that of John Thomas, the surgeon of 1545. In the fifty years which had elapsed since his death, large additions had been made to the literature of this country, so that Lorkyn's library is much more English in character than any of his predecessors.

In general literature he had Ascham's *Schoolmaster*, Bale's *Votaries*, Eliot's *Governor*, More's *Utopia*, Skelton's *Poems*, Stubbs' *Anatomy of Abuses*, and Thevet's *New found world*. The first edition of Camden's *Britannia*, published five years before, is valued at half-a-crown. There are many law books, Sir Robert Broke's *Abridgment*, Fitzherbert's *Justice of the Peace*, *The manner of Holding Court Leets and Court Baron* etc. The fashionable science of Heraldry is represented by Gerard Legh's *Accidence of Armory*, and Ferne's *Blazon of Gentry*<sup>1</sup>.

<sup>1</sup> A list of some English books in his library will be found in the Appendix, No. IV.



*William Butler, 1536–1618.*

Perhaps the most renowned medical practitioner of Cambridge was William Butler, who died in 1618. There is a long account of him in Cooper's *Annals*, Vol. III. pp. 119–24. He started practice late in life, as it was not until he was 37 years of age that the University granted him a licence to practise physic, and he never took the degree of Doctor of Medicine<sup>1</sup>. In his will, made when he was over 80, he describes himself as a student of philosophy and medicine. He acquired the most extraordinary reputation in his profession, his eccentricities being almost as wonderful as his knowledge. He was frequently consulted by King James I, who, when he met with a hunting accident at Newmarket, in November, 1614, at once sent for Butler, who was then nearly 80. Even in these days of luxurious motor cars, a royal patient at Newmarket would be rather a burden to an octogenarian Cambridge doctor. For such journeys as these Dr Butler had a coach bed of his own, with large black cushions. When the King was at Cambridge in the following May, he was closeted with the doctor for nearly an hour. This may have been because he enjoyed his humour, or because he was admiring and coveting the doctor's collection of curiosities. And perhaps this visit had something to do with the disposal of the greater part of that collection. This brings me to mention one of this doctor's leading characteristics. Unlike so many of his professional brethren, he cared little for money. According to Fuller he was better pleased with presents than money, loved what was pretty rather than what was costly, and preferred rarities to riches. The inventory of his goods when he died bears out this statement.

Butler had been a fellow of Clare College, and when he died he was a considerable benefactor to that society. He gave them all his folio books, worth £127 according to the public valuers, and two pots, one called Serpentine, and another made of crystal, pearl and silver. The latter is still in the possession of the College. He also directed his executor to spend £260 in buying a gold communion cup for the College.

<sup>1</sup> See Dr Venn's Introduction to Grace Book Δ, p. xiv.

He was not married, but lived with an apothecary named John Crane, to whom he left most of his estate. Crane exhibited an inventory of the deceased's goods in April, 1618. This is a strange list, and seems to describe a house with some of the rooms furnished, and those only partially. The contents of different rooms are not given. He had only two bedsteads and two pairs of blankets, one for himself and one for his old servant Nell, who used to fetch him home from a tavern at bedtime. The number of stools is remarkable. There were twelve red leather stools, ten of black leather, nine joined stools, three embroidered carsey stools, five tuff-taffety stools, besides a dozen chairs of leather, velvet or taffety. He also had fourteen cushions of various kinds, so he was no ascetic in the way of comfort. Only one square table is mentioned, but their place is supplied to some extent by the following items. Fifteen small cupboards, two Danish chests, two cabinets, divers desks, thirteen trunks great and small, eight presses great and small, &c., &c. Now, what were in these presses, trunks and cupboards? Some of them contained his linen, his clothes, valued at £10, and his silver, valued at £9. The others contained his curiosities. The common articles of Dr Butler's everyday life we should value almost as treasures now, so how should we regard his rarities? I can tell you what some of them were.

Fifty-two pictures of limned work, and divers sentences written on tables, valued at £5. 10s.

Three prospective pictures and another, 30s.

Five wax tables, one great crucifix, one small crucifix, a picture of our Lady, 10s.

Eight alabaster pictures, great and small, £5.

The next lot, of which the contents are baldly enumerated by the appraisers, would turn out a golden harvest for the present day collector, if he could get them at the price.

A bottle of Ivory, 2 stone pictures, 2 steel pictures, 2 Ivory pictures, a silk picture, an enamelled picture, divers small pictures, a prospective glass, a snakeskin and an ostrich egg, 30s.



The biggest item in the inventory, of more than half the total value, is this:

Divers jewels and pictures, which the King had, and for two cupps, £320.

There is no mention of the King in Butler's will. Perhaps the King's visit to him at Cambridge in May, 1615, explains this item. That there was something irregular about the inventory is shown by a note at the bottom of it by the "Registrar's" clerk, to the effect that it was brought to him by the Deputy Chancellor's man, who commanded him to receive it although no names were to it.

A comparison of the values of the various portions of Butler's goods shows him true to his character as given by his contemporaries. The total value of his personalty was £637, of this, his collection of curios accounted for £354, and his books for £167, his linen for £45. This leaves only £71 for his household furniture, clothes, shop and ready money.

In sharp contrast with Dr Butler's, is the personal property of Dr Stephen Perse, the founder of the grammar school, and probably the most wealthy doctor of medicine who has lived and died in Cambridge, although he may not have practised his profession there. His personal estate was valued at over £14,000, and he had landed estates in addition. He was a fellow of Caius, and lived in College, so his household furniture is not particularly interesting. "Three sugar loafes, & for sea coal irons & for one desk £3. 12s. 6d." is a curious conjunction of items. His library, and the furniture of his study, including the Dornick hangings, are valued at £30, and the hangings alone in another room are valued at £10, but his clothes were worth £80, and his household linen £4. One would have expected that a College don who left a large amount of money to found a grammar school would have been a booky man, but the relative values of his books, clothes, and linen compare unfavourably with those of his friend Dr Butler, whose books were valued at sixteen times the amount of his clothes, instead of a quarter of the amount in Dr Perse's case.

The largest items in his inventory are :

Divers debts due to deceased, esteemed to be good debts,  
£10,000.

Desperate debts due to him, £3311<sup>1</sup>.

In the Cole manuscripts in the British Museum there are several references to Cambridge doctors of the eighteenth century. Cole was on intimate terms with the eccentric Dr Glyn, and in May, 1779, he makes the following note : " Being ill with St Anthony's fire eruption about my shoulders, and gouty humours flying about me, I sent to Dr Glyn for his advice." The medicine ordered by the doctor was a teaspoonful of cinchona bark, in a large tumbler of chamomile tea, twice a day, which was a very nauseous draught indeed. Dr Glyn also regaled his patient with various pieces of gossip and scandal, which were perhaps more welcome than the medicine. One piece of gossip concerned Dr Cook, Provost of King's, a particular aversion of Cole, and represented him as having melted down Provost Argentine's fine basin and ewer, in order to get some modern plate which would be more to the taste of his wife. Cole declares that this piece of plate was one of the most curious in the University. The handle to the ewer was a wyvern finely carved, and in the middle of the basin were the donor's arms embossed and enamelled, standing an inch high<sup>2</sup>.

In the following March Cole records the fact that his apothecary Mr Price bled him for his cold<sup>3</sup>, which I should hope also served for his spring blood letting. But our antiquary was a gouty creature, and bleeding probably made him feel better.

There are many medical and other recipes scattered about his manuscripts, for there were plenty of amateur doctors then. Amongst them is a remedy for cancer, called antimonial white drop. The directions for use are "Take two drops in a small glass of water in the morning fasting for two or three days

<sup>1</sup> University Inventories, Bdle 10.

<sup>2</sup> Addit. MSS. 5822, p. 47, and 5814, p. 67.

<sup>3</sup> Addit. MSS. 5855, p. 28.



together, then forbear as many days and then proceed again, until the small vial is finished. They seldom work visibly, but are said to have worked wonders in cancerous cases." In 1763 Cole sent a bottle of these drops to a poor honest woman with cancer in the lip. Later on he adds "It did no good to the poor woman<sup>1</sup>." Evidently they did not act visibly or invisibly.

## VI. MISCELLANEOUS.

### *Fees.*

We now come to the subject of fees, a very pleasant one for the doctor, when he gets them. But unfortunately, to a person in the full enjoyment of health, a doctor's bill is not so agreeable a visitor as the doctor is himself when that person is ill. This fact was expressed in a Latin epigram by a learned physician, many centuries ago, which has been translated as follows :

Three faces the Phisitian hath, first as an angel, he,  
When he is sought, next when he helps, a god he seems to be;  
And last of all, when he hath made the sickly person well,  
And asks his guerdon, then he seems an ugly fiend of Hell.

This version is from a recent number of the *Cornhill Magazine*. And a four line verse of English doggerel is probably familiar to you :

God and the doctor we alike adore,  
But only when in danger, not before;  
The danger o'er, both are alike requited,  
God is forgotten and the doctor slighted.

I do not propose to lay bare my personal grievances in this matter, as there are earlier instances which would be much more interesting. And in particular I should like to take you to the village of Parson's Drove, near Wisbech, in the year 1622, where in a house on Murrow Bank lived a middle-aged woman named Elizabeth Gayles with her son and daughter. On the same bank, but a little nearer Murrow, lived a gentleman named Thomas Butler, who was practising as a surgeon. Another man of the same surname was in practice at Wisbech

<sup>1</sup> Addit. MSS. 5822, p. 59.

in 1640. On the twentieth of June, 1622, Mrs Gayles went before a neighbouring justice of the peace, and laid an information against Mr Butler for witchcraft and robbery. This was no light matter, when witches were burnt. The circumstances which led up to this move of Mrs Gayles were as follows. About ten years before, Butler had come to Murrow Bank to undertake the cure of a Mr Sayes who lived near by. Butler had no house there then, so he lodged with Mrs Gayles. On several other occasions when attending Mr Sayes, he lodged with her also. This represents the leisurely methods of cure adopted by the medical practitioners of that day. During one of his visits Butler undertook some kind of a cure on his landlady's son, but for what disease, he said in 1622, he could not remember. Apparently he had demanded some payment for the same, for Mrs Gayles asserted that Butler had told her that her son was grieved with a spirit, and had taken in hand to cast the spirit out of him but did not cure him. This Butler denied, and pressed for payment. So Mrs Gayles went to a neighbouring justice with her information. The information is a very wordy one, but the following is an abstract.

About twelve months before, Butler slept at her house one night in May, and in the morning told her that he had been disturbed by noises during the night, which he thought must be due to an apish spirit. And looking round the house said that he thought there was some money hidden between two doors there. Soon afterwards an acquaintance of Butler's slept at her house, and during the night got up and fetched in another man whom she thinks was Butler. They got a light and went into the parlour chamber. She tried to wake her son and daughter who were sleeping in the room with her, but could not, neither could she move out of the room. As soon as it was daylight, her son got up and went to work. Then she went into the parlour chamber, where she saw a thick grey mist about an ell high, with the leg of a man sticking out of it. Being frightened she ran back into the kitchen, and Butler's friend soon after left the house. When next the same man slept at her house, in the morning she went to his room to call him and found him sitting on the bed covered with cobwebs.



When he was putting on his cloak, she noticed that his breeches' pockets were sticking out, and on feeling them, found that they were full of money. This money she believes to be her's, for she had once hidden £40 in the thatch of that chamber and it had now disappeared. The most incredible part of the deposition is this. That all the time that Butler and his friend were coming to her house, which was from May-day to Candlemas, so often as she went into the parlour chamber, she could remember what she had heard and seen, but as soon as she was come down again her remembrance was taken away, so that she could never speak or think of these things nor of the money hidden in the thatch. As a proof of the black witchcraft going on in that room, she states that some cheese which was in the rack in the parlour chamber, putrified, but the cheese in other parts of the house remained good. Another tale was, that about the midsummer previous, she was walking on Murrow Bank, between her house and Butler's, "when she heard a great noise and felt something very heavy light upon her left shoulder, and so removed to her neck, and ear, and then removed and was as a mist before her eyes, so that she was blind, whereupon she sat her down and after a while the mist wasted and she recovered." There are several other incidents of like character, all of which she attributed to Butler's spirits.

Butler met all the accusations with a flat denial, and I should hope that the grand jury threw out the bill of indictment at the assizes. Whether Butler had robbed her or not, we cannot be sure, but we can be certain that Mrs Gayles was a liar.

It was customary for nobles and others in high station to pay their doctors a salary in early days, as has been seen in the case of Dr Lemster. But probably ordinary people paid by bill. I have not been fortunate enough to light upon any doctor's bills of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, but judging from the fortunes which they left behind them, some of them must have collected long bills in their time.

The earliest individual fees which I have come across are those paid to parish doctors. Medical advice to the poor by

contract was an invention of the nineteenth century only, consequently in earlier times we find interesting items in parish accounts like this:—

1683. The overseers of the Parish of Linton, debtors to John Harvey, surgeon there, for John Jeffery's leg :

For setting his legge and cure, and 30 visits	10 <sup>s</sup> [= 4 <sup>d</sup> a visit]
---	--

For Plaisters, oyntment, spirits, cordials and pills	10 <sup>s</sup> <i>Total</i> £1.
--	----------------------------------

And then follows this memorandum: "For such a cure of any other but this, being upon the town's account, I could not afford it under 40<sup>s</sup>, but in respect of its public charge I will have but 20<sup>s</sup>, which I hope none contained can make any objection, which if they do I will not give them an offensive occasion, but relie upon such satisfaction, as shall be to your general content." Such submissiveness must surely have disarmed any cheeseparers in the Linton vestry. John Harvey was, I believe, a Quaker, and was not a surgeon alone, for in 1689 he supplied the town with gunpowder, so he was grocer as well as apothecary.

But the overseers did not really stick at expense when they made up their minds to cure a man. For instance, in 1725, the overseers of Meldreth made a determined effort to cure Richard Bigrave. In August he was sent to Cambridge with a nurse for a fortnight, and at the end of the following month to a London Hospital. This cost the parish £6. Next year he was sent again to Cambridge to Dr Sams, who took 5 guineas in fees. Richard then died, fortunately perhaps for the ratepayers.

It seems to have been a common occurrence to send a pauper to live near a surgeon in town for treatment. Thus in 1694, George Mason of Meldreth was sent to Mr Harrison, a surgeon of Cambridge, with a man to look after him. The surgeon's fee was 65s., the attendant's 34s. In 1720, a man was sent from the same parish to live in a surgeon's house at Royston, to be cured of the itch.

Amongst the parish documents of Linton and Meldreth are many surgeons' and apothecaries' bills for the end of the



eighteenth century which go into minute details. Some of the items have elaborate names, such as pectoral lohock, epulotic ointment, attenuating epithem, solutive electuary, volatile liniment and digestive ointment. At Meldreth, in 1777, Dr Talwin started a man with two vomiting powders, probably tartar emetic, and afterwards gave him two pound's worth of Peruvian electuary. It was evidently a case of ague. The vomit of a person with "the ager" was supposed to have a corrosive effect, even on a brick floor. Was this due to the ejected tartar emetic? Names of diseases seldom occur in these bills. Itch, small-pox and dropsy, are all that I have noticed. Dr Talwin's charge for a day journey from Royston to Meldreth, which is under four miles, was half-a-crown. If he was called into a second house he charged 1s. 6d.; but for a night journey in winter he charged half-a-guinea. These charges did not include medicine, which was charged for as follows: mixtures 2s.; draughts 1s.; ointments and liniments 1s. to 2s.; boluses 4d. to 6d.; 5 doz. mercurial pills cost 2s. The charges for journeys to pauper patients in the Linton district now, some of them living six miles away, work out at less than a shilling each, which also includes medicine. As regards what are now called extra medical fees, Mr Eve, a Linton surgeon, received three guineas for curing a broken leg in 1777. Broken arms were mended for half-a-guinea, which was also the charge for an ordinary midwifery case. The surgeon's bill for attendance on the poor of Linton from Michaelmas, 1808 to April, 1809 was over £17, which is more than the contract fee at the present time, although much more attention is required by the surgeon. Parish doctors of a century ago evidently lived in clover!

The earliest instances of medical contracts in these records are dated 1826 and 1827. In the former year, Alfred Jenkins contracted to vaccinate the poor of Meldreth, a parish of 650 people, for £5. At least half the people would be reckoned poor, so he was vaccinating at 4d. a case. For the year 1827 the same man contracted to attend the poor for all illnesses, without extras, for £12, which is certainly a much higher rate than that at present in force<sup>1</sup>.

<sup>1</sup> More details concerning medical attendance on paupers will be found in a pamphlet published by the writer in 1896, entitled *Meldreth Parish Records*.

Now with regard to the fees for medical attendance on private patients. I have looked at one series of apothecaries' bills for the eighteenth century, and these were rendered to no less a personage than James Yorke, Lord Bishop of Ely. They were rendered by members of the Muriel family, who were apothecaries at Ely for at least three generations. Robert Muriel, who sent in his bill for three guineas and a half for the quarter ending midsummer 1791, was a very neat writer. His bill contains fifty-six items, but nothing about visits; and reads rather like a chemist's bill of to-day. He supplied the groom with flowers of sulphur and liver of antimony, the ladies of the household with tincture of myrrh, and the cook with cream of tartar. The most expensive item is horseballs, eighteen of which cost 9s. Most members of the episcopal household brought grist to his mill. He bled the cook, extracted the kitchen maid's tooth, for which a shilling is charged, gave the porter a mercurial bolus, supplied a plaster for the postillion's lumbago, Mrs Yorke's footman had a repelling ointment, and the Bishop's footman a box of alterative pills; the laundry-maid had tincture of rhubarb, and the under-gardener an ounce of the best salts. Tar water, then a fashionable remedy, is charged at 1s. a bottle. Members of the Bishop's family also had medicines, but it is not fair to divulge their family secrets. The Lord Bishop did not take much of Mr Muriel's medicine in 1791, but in November, 1804, he took twelve bottles, each of four doses, and costing 4s. 6d. each. In May, 1807, he took twenty-two bottles at 5s. each, and he died early the next year<sup>1</sup>.

### *Surgical Instruments.*

The surgical instruments which are mentioned in the wills and inventories of early practitioners are few, for few were used by ordinary surgeons. The chief part of the education of

<sup>1</sup> Bishop Yorke kept all his receipted bills, and they are still in existence in the episcopal muniment room at Ely. Bills of carpenters, hairdressers, liverymen and painters; bills for his clothes, and of his expenses on his journeys from Ely to London and elsewhere, by which you may know how much he paid at toll-gates, &c., packet after packet, neatly tied up and docketed, a fine mass of material for the curious.



the barber-surgeon who intended to practise surgery, was to learn the twenty points on the body where veins could be tapped, to learn the proper vein for each disease, and the proper hour of the day when phlebotomy should be performed. For the latter a complicated table of numbers and signs of the Zodiac was used.

A case of lancets was the chief and sometimes the only equipment of the early surgeon. Marshall of Ely in 1703, had only a case of lancets. The instruments of some practitioners have already been mentioned, and I can give a few more instances.

John Soward, surgeon and scholar of Clare, in 1552, had a box with four silver instruments worth 4s., a syringe with a pipe of silver, a pair of scissors "and other instruments."

John Paske, a surgeon, whose chattells were appraised on the 8th of February, 1587, "after the English account," had a very peculiar lot of surgical instruments, which it took me some time to find. His house consisted of hall, shop and two chambers, with a poor lot of furniture. The shop contained a counter and several coffers, with some tapestry hangings. But there was no mention of drugs or instruments. In the yard, however, was a grindstone, which must have been required to sharpen something on. So I carefully went through the items again, but the only tools I could find, and they were in the hall, were these: three axes, two hatchets, eleven wedges, and a "wrong" hook. Mr Paske evidently had no sympathy with conservative surgery.

The Bridge Street surgeon, Richard Willows, who lived about the same time, has his instruments rather scornfully treated by the appraisers; they write

"All his instruments, 4 cupping glasses, one payer of scales and other trash—5s."

I am sorry to say that the details of the doctors' shops are often treated in this manner. Instruments were altogether absent from some shops, unless included in the "trash."

The most valuable lot of instruments was that possessed by Edward Allot, a bachelor of medicine and professor of surgery, who died in 1636. His silver box of instruments was

valued at £15. But then he was a wealthy man, and had a warming-pan hanging up in his kitchen, and a box containing 3 lbs. of sugar candy in the hall.

Martin Buck, an apothecary who died later in the century, mentions several instruments. A seal-skin case with several chirurgical instruments called lancets, a seal-skin plaster box with instruments, two silver catheters and a silver syringe, and a seal-skin salutory. The seal-skin cases were a parade of affluence, such as has not yet quite left us.

Thomas Day, another apothecary of that century, disposes in his will of the following. A silver catheter, a silver potion cup, a little silver beaker, and a "silver spoon that is made to administer physic to children." Evidently he was in the habit of seeing his own medicines properly administered, and so perhaps saving them from being poured down the sink.

John Parman, a surgeon, of Bene't College, directed his surgical instruments to be sold to help pay his debts, so he must have set some value on them, probably more than the appraisers would have done.

### *Medical Libraries.*

The professional libraries of the olden time doctors vary according to their means, the period at which they lived, and according to whether they were physicians or surgeons. The three earliest practitioners concerning whose books there is any account, Thomas, Soward and Pickering, had three points in common. They all read Galen and the *Rule of Salerno*, and neither of them had any book in English on Medicine or Surgery. Of course the variety of works on those subjects in the vernacular was not great. Guido was translated in 1541 Borde's *Breviary of Health* was published in 1542, and John de Vigo in 1543. But the *Great Herbal* was issued in 1513, and the *Surgery of Jerome of Brunswick* in English in 1525. It may be that books in French and Latin were cheaper than English books.

The vade-mecums of the surgeons were the works of Guy de Cauliac and John de Vigo. The former was a Frenchman who



became Papal physician at Avignon, and is celebrated as having braved two visitations of the plague in that city. His surgery has been printed many times. Thomas had copies in Latin and French which had been sold for 8*d.* and 4*d.* respectively. Soward's copy was valued at 10*d.*, and the *Anatomy* of the same author at 8*d.* Widdows, in 1588, had a volume in English called *Guido's Questions*, valued at 8*d.*<sup>1</sup>

John de Vigo is styled "Head surgeon of our Time" in the English translation of 1543. His *Art of Surgery* was first printed in 1518. Thomas's copy had been sold for 6*d.*, Soward and Widdows also had copies.

Soward had several works by Leonard Fuchs, the German physician, whose name is familiar to us in the Fuchsia plant, including copies of his chief work, *De natura stirpium*, published in 1542, valued at 10*d.*, and his *Icones stirpium*, published in Paris three years before, valued at 4*d.* Galen's *De temperamentis*, probably printed at Cambridge, is valued at 1*s.* The popular side of medicine is represented by the poem ascribed to Macer, called *De virtutibus herbarum*.

The favourite author of John Thomas was the Italian physician George Valla. He had several of the works of Galen edited by him, as well as original works on medicine. But no copy of the Cambridge Galen is mentioned. His botany was represented by a herbal in French which had been sold for 4*d.*

Widdows, as is inferred from his library, was not so cultured a man as some of his contemporaries, which is perhaps the reason why he patronised native productions. Besides the *Questions* of Guido, he had a copy of Vicary's *Englishman's Treasure*, which was published in 1548. It was a treatise on anatomy, and has been republished many times. His other reference books were two antidotaries or books of medical recipes, valued at 6*d.* each; one of the most celebrated was published by Clusius in 1561. His *Herbal* and the usual copy of the *Rule of Salerno* seem to have been in Latin.

<sup>1</sup> This must have been a book published by George Baker in 1579, and entitled "Guidos Questions newly corrected, whereunto is a thirde and fourth book of Galen, with a Treatise for the helps of all the outward parts of the man's body, and also an excellent antidotary, &c. &c. &c."

Two books of "Secreatees" are valued at 12*d.* These were probably the medical compilations of Alexis of Piedmont, first published at Basle in 1536, and translated into English in 1562.

Dr Pickering's medical library (1551) was of much greater extent than any of those yet considered. His collections of the works of Galen were of more value than the libraries of Soward, Thomas and Widdows combined. Galen in Greek, 5 vols., is valued at £2. He had twelve other Galen volumes, including *De temperamentis*, greco-lat., value 8*d.* The latter must be Siberch's publication. His favourite modern author was the German physician Otto Brunfels.

The mere mention of the medical authors used by Pickering would take some time. Amongst the ancients were Hippocrates, Celsus, Rhazes, Avicenna, Paulus Aegineta and Aetius. Amongst the moderns, the anatomy of Mondino, the pharmacy of Mesue, the medical epistles of Manardus, the dispensary of Fuchs, and two works by Fernels, the French court physician, which are not in Watt. A copy of Ketham's *Fasiculus medicinae* is valued at 1*s.* 4*d.*; the same work in Thomas's list is only 1*d.*

He had no copy of the *English Herbal* nor of Vicary's *Anatomy*, but his library was very well stocked for the age in which he lived. Evidently his estimate of his predecessors was different from that of a great physician of the next century. Sydenham, when asked what books a young physician should read, answered, "Read *Don Quixote*, it's a very good book, I often read it myself."

Dr Hatcher's medical library is on a different plane from that of any of his predecessors. It seems to have comprised all the books worth reading which had been published during or before his time. His Galen, in 5 vols., was valued at £3, Avicenna at 13*s.* 4*d.*, Dioscorides at 5*s.*; the *Rosa Anglica*, a medical treatise of the 14th century, at 20*d.* Other medical authors are Fallopius, Arnold de Nova Villa, Gratarolus, Cardan, Albucasis, Benedictus Victorius, &c. He had an English book on surgery valued at 12*d.*, and Dr Bright's *Treatise on English Medicine*. This was probably by Dr Timothy Bright, the father of English shorthand, who died in 1615<sup>1</sup>. But this work

<sup>1</sup> It was published in 1580. See *Timothe Bright*, by W. J. Carlton, 1911.



is not mentioned in Watt. A black-letter book, valued at 1*d.*, published in 1540, has the fascinating and sonorous title "This is the myrrour or glasse of helth necessary and nedefull for every person to loke in, that will keep their bodye from the sicknesse of the pestilence, &c. &c."

Dr Lorkyn's books were not so numerous as those of his father-in-law, but they are more English in character. He had the inevitable Galen, in 6 vols. folio, the value of which had dropped to 8*s.* The works of Gesner, in 3 vols., being his most valuable medical work, at £3. The Anatomy of Vesalius was worth 13*s.* The works of the Arabian physicians Avicenna, Rhazes and Serapio, were in Latin. He had several works on veterinary medicine, one of them being in English. Dr William Turner's *Herbal*, published in 1568, is valued at 5*s.*, and a book called *A Hundred and Fourteen Experiments of Paracelsus*, at 2*d.* A book with a quaint title is *The difference of the olde physic taught by the godlee fathers and the new from Galen*. It was published in 1585, and is valued at 2*d.*

After the end of the sixteenth century, the inventories do not name individual books, but sometimes interesting items concerning books are found in wills. For instance, in the year 1633 a medical practitioner named John Furtho, who was a fellow of Trinity, bequeathed to his College Library twenty of his best books, whichever they should choose. If they should choose "Fryar Bacon's" manuscript, they should be allowed to have it, but only on this condition: if the true owner ever claimed it, the College was to give it up and make a copy of it before parting. This MS. may still be in Trinity College Library. The doctor wished to be buried in Trinity College Chapel in the night time, without any funeral pomp, and a day or two afterwards the master and fellows were to have a feast, "reasonable and competent exceedings," in the common hall. He used to attend St Botolph Church, where he had lying a Latin Bible, a Greek Testament, and a Tremelius Bible with gilt leaves. An unusual amount of ready money was found in his house, some of it in unexpected places. Sixty-three pounds was first found, and towards the end of the inventory is "Found afterwards more in gold £145. 16." One of his

legacies may have some connection with this, "To my godson, my grinding stones, and my Muller cushions to cut gold." Not many years before, a fellow of Trinity was condemned to be hanged for clipping coin. I don't suggest that Furtho deserved the same fate, but the coincidence of the large amount of gold and the instruments to cut that metal is curious. Taking into consideration the value which he set on "Fryar Bacon's" manuscript, I should rather think the doctor was an alchemist and had been searching for the fabled philosopher's stone. The University appraisers were not usually backward in making a valuation, but the "Fryar's" manuscript beat them. They made a special memorandum that they had not valued it. Perhaps they were afraid of it.

### *Pictures.*

There could have been few pictures hanging on the walls of doctors' consulting rooms in early times, and very few in their houses at all. In some inventories, where articles down to a penny in value are noted, no pictures are mentioned.

Amongst the furniture of Dr Lorkyn, in 1591, three portraits are an interesting item. A picture of Dr Hatcher, another of Dr Lorkyn, each valued at 5s., and Sir Francis Drake's picture valued at a shilling. These seem low prices for painted portraits, but I do not know what else they can have been. There were men living in Cambridge at this time who called themselves limners, and were portrait painters.

About the same time in the list of the furniture of a Cambridge physician's study, made in his lifetime, there are several pictures. A picture of the passion of Christ with a gilt frame and a curtain is valued at £2; the owner's own picture is valued at 10s.; that of Queen Anne Boleyn at 5s.; and an emblem of Love at the same price. A map of England and another of Europe are priced at 2s. 10d. The valuations are the owner's own. His lute is put down at £10. A curious item of this man's furniture is a cushion of the bark of trees, which was in the window-seat<sup>1</sup>.

<sup>1</sup> Bodleian Lib. Rawlinson MSS. D 213.



Amongst Dr John Furtho's furniture were thirty maps and pictures great and small, which are valued at £3. 10s.

Thomas Grimstone, a doctor of medicine, who died in 1608, had eleven pictures; their values are difficult to ascertain, as four pictures and a stillatory are valued at £3. 4s., and so on. At the same period the rich apothecary, Richard Love, had only two pictures; these were in the hall, and with curtains and curtain-rods were valued at only half-a-crown.

Dr Robert Wells in 1632 had twelve maps and two tables of Cambridge and Oxford priced at 13s. 4d., and twenty-five coats of arms and pictures at 6s. 8d. Dr Collins, the regius professor, also had three tables of Cambridge and Oxford, which with three pictures and a tapestry carpet are valued at £2. 8s. I should be glad if any one would tell me what these tables of Cambridge and Oxford were.

Dr Nichols, in 1646, had two pictures in his parlour next the street which were worth 12s., and in his hall were six small pictures, valued with table, stools and chairs at £3. 2s. 6d.

The only country surgeon who had any pictures was Thomas Marshall, of March. He had some in his kitchen and no where else.

### *Modes of conveyance.*

The doctor of the olden time had only two ways of getting about, either by walking or riding horseback. There may have been carriage roads in some parts of the country, but patients do not always live on high roads, and much time may be saved by riding across country. In fact, in the old days a doctor could only get round by travelling as the crow flies. In the north country we read of doctors who took a week to get round their patients, sleeping each night wherever darkness caught them. But it could never have been so bad in this county.

The horses owned by the Cambridge doctors of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries were not costly ones. Dr Marshall, of Ely, had three mares valued at £9. Dr Crofts, of the same place, had one worth £6. Another doctor of Ely who lived thirty years later had a chaise. The by-roads were then getting more passable perhaps. His mare and filly were valued at £7,

his chaise and harness at £22, his riding harness at 15s. Of the Cambridge town doctors, Pickering in 1552 had a little nag valued at £2, and Paske, the radical surgeon, a nag and a colt worth the same. Dr Hatcher had two horses, a brown and a bay, valued at £6. 10s.; two saddles and a side-saddle, but no carriage. In the next century Dr Francis had a riding horse and two colts valued at £10. Dr Brydon, in 1580, had in his stable two milch kine instead of horses, but he had a pillion amongst his household goods, so at one time perhaps he used to take his wife with him on his rounds seated on the pillion behind him. Several surgeons had riding harness and clothes, but no horse. They all probably got more out of their horses than we do, but they were not always in such a hurry to get there. The eccentric Dr Butler used a coach bed for travelling in his old age, but was a great rider in his youth, frequently riding from Cambridge to London. One of the many tales told about him refers to one of his journeys on horseback. "A gent lying a dying sent his servant with a horse for the doctor, the horse being exceeding dry, ducks down his head strongly into the water, and plucks down the doctor over his head, who was plunged in the water over head and ears. The doctor was maddened and would return home. The servant swore that he should not, drew his sword, and gave him ever and anon, when he would return, a little prick and so drove him before him to his master." A sorry plight for the doctor, and also for the patient!

The little nag of Dr Pickering, in 1552, in due course became the smart carriage and pair of the last century and the powerful motor-car of this. But the country doctor still has his miry roads, his lanes which run along the beds of water-courses, and still has to wander on pitch dark nights across marshes and swollen streams.

An entry in the parish register of Stanground records the tragedy of one of this unfortunate class.

"A.D. 1668. Feb. 3. Thomas Jones, doctor of Physic, being accidentally drowned in his journey homeward from a certain poor patient on a dark night without a companion, was taken up hard by the town and here buried."



Poor Dr Jones, tired with being in a stuffy cottage bedroom for some hours, was hurrying home to his anxious wife when he slipped into the dark water of the Ouse, swirling with lumps of ice and snow, a horrible death.

*Church spoil.*

There are a few items in the inventories which suggest the spoil of churches. Thus John Thomas, in 1545, had a pillow-case worked with an image of silk and an old coverlet with flowers. John Soward, in 1552, had a tapestry bed covering worked with images, valued at 7s. Pratt and Pickering had various painted hangings. Richard Love, in 1603, had a coverlet of tapestry, a valuable piece of work, since ten pair of flaxen sheets are estimated at the same value. Dr Butler had many valuable articles which seem ecclesiastical; but Dr Hatcher, who lived in the house from which the Austin Friars had been ejected, had undoubted ecclesiastic spoils. Leaving out the painted hangings with which many of his smaller rooms were hung, in a chest in his ghostly great chamber were the following:

A cope of tissue upon green velvet, with a cape and border	
of Images of needlework	35 <sup>s</sup>
An auter cloth of purple velvet with branches $3\frac{3}{4}$ yds.	25 <sup>s</sup>
A piece of redd velvet, embroidered with angels	20 <sup>s</sup>
A cope of needle work and a border which was a cope	5 <sup>s</sup>
Two grene pieces and 13 pieces of white branched silk	10 <sup>s</sup>
Certeyn old pieces of copys, with 3 of red velvet embroi- dered	5 <sup>s</sup>

Thus the estimated value of the contents of this chest was £5.

VII. ON SEEKING FURTHER ADVICE IN THE  
FIFTEENTH CENTURY.

It is not uncommon in the present day to find, that when the family doctor does not cure a sick person as quickly as he is expected to do, another doctor is consulted, and the sick person or his friends veil their dissatisfaction with the

euphonious expression of seeking further advice. But this custom is not of entirely modern growth. And an interesting Cambridgeshire instance occurs amongst the Chancery Proceedings of the reign of Henry VII<sup>1</sup>. In the year 1489 John Dobson, a bachelor of divinity, of Trinity College, was appointed to the vicarage of Melbourn. Shortly afterwards he had an attack of hemiplegia, or paralysis of one side of his body. Such attacks are uncommon under the age of 40, but we may conclude that he was as old as that, by his having taken the degree of bachelor of divinity thirteen years before. Dobson's description of the attack is, that by the visitation of God he was taken and suddenly benumbed with a great palsy, on his left side, that is to say from the highest point of his arm to the lowest part of his foot on the same side. He says nothing about losing the power of speech, as he would have done had his right side been paralysed. But although he could say mass, he could not perform an important part of his office, the elevation of the Host. So his means of living was gone unless he could get cured. No doubt he consulted the bonesetter, the leech and the wise woman of the village, and also had the best advice which Cambridge could afford. They all, or as many as he would submit to, bled him and drenched him with purgatives, until he would no longer bleed, and then they prescribed a large dose of time and patience, which alone would work his cure. It was excellent advice, but it was cold comfort for an emaciated man, with an active spirit and a large bedsore on his back, and we can imagine that Mr Dobson said to himself, "I have money in my purse, and if help can be had, I will have it. By our Lady, I will hie me to London town, to the specialist."

Melbourn is on one of the main roads from Cambridge to London, and about forty-four miles from the latter place. The road between them was passable for carriages. A century earlier, there is a record of a pipe of wine being carted from London to Swaffham Bulbeck, and breaking down in the village of Melbourn. And where a pipe of wine could travel, a horse-litter would be able to get along too.

<sup>1</sup> Early Chanc. Proceedings, Bdle 131, No. 8.



Mr Dobson relates how in the month of July "for due cure and perfect remedy of his infirmity, he came in a horse-litter from the towne of Melbourn to the city of London." There he fell into the hands of the specialist, and his real troubles began. The name of the surgeon whom he consulted was John Brown, who was a warden of the Barber-Surgeons in 1494. It is quite possible that he was born at Melbourn, as the manor of Trayley's there was owned by the Brown family. If so, this fifteenth century specialist cannot be complimented on his treatment of a patient from his native village. Mr Dobson's consultation with the surgeon resulted in a covenant being drawn up in proper legal fashion. By this it was agreed that "John Brown should endeavour him by the grace of God to do his cure for the recovery and help of the said sickness," and that Dobson should pay him £10 for the cure. This was a large sum, as the gross yearly value of the vicarage was under £20. You will observe that the surgeon had a cure of his own, he was "to do his cure" on the vicar, so he was a true specialist. In order to safeguard himself, the vicar had included these conditions in the covenant, that half the money was to be paid when he could walk without a crutch, and could hold both arms above his head, or as he puts it, when he "might go with or without a staff, and wield his arms up to his head so that he might say mass and do such things as longeth to his office"; and that the other half was to be paid thirteen weeks after he was made completely whole. This arrangement seems all right; it was as far as the patient was concerned, but what about the poor specialist? It allowed him nothing for his trouble in case he did not effect a cure. But the surgeon was a wily man, a man of experience, this was not his first case, and he had had failures, perhaps. So he persuaded the vicar to be bound in an obligation of £20 to compel him to fulfil his part of the bargain when cured. The simple country priest, this fifteenth century vicar of Wakefield, having no desire to cheat the surgeon, made no objection to signing the obligation, but he surely did not understand its full import. For it rendered him liable to be sued for £20 in about six months' time.

The cure went on during the summer and autumn and well

into the winter, but without much improvement in the patient. At length the obligation or bond became due. Then the surgeon unmasked his guns. "Master Dobson, you must pay me something for my trouble," said he to the vicar. "But," answered the vicar, and these are his very words, "I am in like case as I was when first you took me in cure and no better," and he would not pay the surgeon, who then left off attending.

The poor vicar, "trusting of remedy of his sickness," had now been more than six months in the city at great expense to himself, but worse was to come. By means of the obligation Brown was now able to commence an action for debt against the vicar in the Sheriff's Court. The vicar put in surety and was prepared to answer, but that was not Brown's object. The object of the astute surgeon is thus quaintly explained in the vicar's words. "Brown now proceedeth no further in the action, but lets it depend in the court, to thentente that Dobson should lie styll in London to his grete costs and charges unto such tyme as by that means he shulde be fain to pay Brown £5, that he demandeth for his labour." The poor paralysed vicar, in London lodgings all that winter, sends his piteous bill of complaint to the Chancellor, asking in the reverence of God and in the name of charity that this suit of debt may be tried in the King's Court and settled, so that he may be allowed to return to his country vicarage.

The Chancery Proceedings from which I extract the above tell us no more about this case, nor the exact dates of the above events. The next appointment of a vicar to Melbourn occurs in 1503. It is possible that Dobson lived until then, but it is unlikely that he recovered the use of his arm, although he might have been able to walk. The fame of London specialists must have been dim in that village for many years to come.



## APPENDIX.

Some materials had been collected concerning the numbers and distribution of medical practitioners in the county at various periods, but they are too fragmentary to be worth tabulation. In 1847 there were more country doctors than there are at the present time, but the incompleteness of details at present to hand render further generalisations untrustworthy.

## I.

HENRY HAYES WISBECH CHYRURGION, 9 OCT. 1702.  
INVENTORY OF HIS GOODS.

His purse and apparel	2 <sup>li</sup> 10 <sup>s</sup>
Four ounces of Cardamom seed, 12 <sup>oz</sup> Coriander seed, 12 <sup>oz</sup> of Gum Elemi, 1 <sup>lb</sup> of Lapis Hibernicus [sulphurous Irish slate ; used for bruises], 12 <sup>oz</sup> of Lapis calaminaris, 1 <sup>oz</sup> of Camphor, 7 <sup>oz</sup> Cortex Winteri, 11 <sup>oz</sup> Aloes Succ', 1 <sup>lb</sup> 13 <sup>oz</sup> Aloes Barb', 1 <sup>lb</sup> 10 <sup>oz</sup> of Cerus' [white lead]	8 <sup>s</sup> 1 <sup>d</sup>
12 <sup>oz</sup> flo: sulphur, one pound more of flo' sulphur, 1 <sup>lb</sup> 15 <sup>oz</sup> Boule Arm' [Armenian Bole: a red earth, probably inert, but still in use], 9 <sup>oz</sup> of Senna, 1 <sup>lb</sup> of Manna, 8 <sup>oz</sup> of powder of liquorish, 8 <sup>oz</sup> of Jerion [? Geryon, quicksilver], 2 <sup>lb</sup> of Frankinsence, 8 <sup>oz</sup> of Olibanum gum, 2 <sup>lb</sup> 8 <sup>oz</sup> red lead, 10 <sup>oz</sup> comeing seed [cumin], 5 <sup>oz</sup> of Roman Viteral [sulphate of copper], 6 <sup>oz</sup> of White Viteral [sulphate of zinc], 5 <sup>oz</sup> of Cantherides, 10 <sup>oz</sup> of Salt Peter, one ounce of Castor Anglie, 12 <sup>oz</sup> of Crud Antimony	10 <sup>s</sup> 3 <sup>½</sup>
Three ounces of Murr, 4 <sup>oz</sup> of Cubebs, 1 <sup>lb</sup> 4 <sup>oz</sup> of gold Litharge [yellow oxide of lead], 8 <sup>oz</sup> of Cream of Taatar, 3 <sup>lb</sup> of Lignum vitæ [guaiacum], 14 <sup>oz</sup> of Cortex Quassiae, 1 <sup>lb</sup> 15 <sup>oz</sup> of Hartshorne shave & one pound of harts-horne burnt [the substance which remains in the retort after the spirit has been distilled from harts-horn shavings]	5 <sup>s</sup> 2 <sup>d</sup>
Two ounces of Jollip, 8 <sup>oz</sup> of Collicinth, 8 <sup>oz</sup> of prepared steel [equal parts of fine steel filings and brown sugar candy rubbed to powder in a mortar, <i>Hoc opus hic</i>	

*labor est!*], 1<sup>oz</sup> Mercurius dulcis [calomel], 1<sup>oz</sup> Mercurius sublimatus, 1<sup>oz</sup> of Scaimony, 2<sup>oz</sup> Spermaceti, 1<sup>oz</sup> Res Jollip, 2<sup>oz</sup> Precip: Rub, 2<sup>oz</sup> of Crabbs eyes [a stony concretion in the crab's head. Accounted absorbent and discussive and good against the stone], 1<sup>oz</sup> of Crosmettil [crocus of antimony],  $\frac{1}{2}$ <sup>oz</sup> of Opium, 1<sup>lb</sup> Fenninet seed [? Fenugrec], 2<sup>oz</sup> of Elixir exproprietatis, 1<sup>oz</sup> of Quicksilver

8<sup>s</sup>

Two ounces of the seed of Hartshorne\*, one ounce of natural balsam [? Balm of Gilead], 1<sup>oz</sup> of Spermaceti almond [a mixture of almond oil and spermaceti, used for anointing the pustules of small pox], a dram of oyle of Cynimon, 1<sup>lb</sup> of (? Mirf) lig\*, 3<sup>lb</sup> of Oxycroceum [an expensive plaster, because of the large quantity of saffron used; and so frequently adulterated], 6<sup>lb</sup> of parisub, [or parisul. Is this emplastrum diasulphuris?], 2<sup>lb</sup> of Mellilot (Plaster), 6<sup>lb</sup> of Diacodium simplex, 2 $\frac{1}{2}$ <sup>lb</sup> of Diacodium nigrum, 1<sup>lb</sup> of Stomach plaister [made of aromatics], 1<sup>lb</sup> 14<sup>oz</sup> of Oyle of Turp:, fower ounces of Oyle of Carui, 1 $\frac{1}{2}$ <sup>lb</sup> of Oyle of Roses, Twelve ounces of Oyle (*sic*), One ounce of Oyle of Spike, 2<sup>lb</sup> of Ung: populium, 3 $\frac{1}{2}$ <sup>lb</sup> of Unguentum Album Camphoratum, 1<sup>lb</sup> of Ung: Dialthee [marsh mallow ointment],  $\frac{1}{2}$ <sup>lb</sup> Ung: Egiptiacum [made of verdigris, honey and vinegar], 10<sup>oz</sup> of Lin: Arce [the liniment of Arcaeus, called after the inventor, was made of gum elemi, turpentine, mutton suet and hogs' lard. It was used instead of Basilicon in wounds of the head], 3<sup>lb</sup> 6<sup>oz</sup> of Venice Turp:, 4<sup>oz</sup> Len: Elect:, 1<sup>lb</sup> 10<sup>oz</sup> of Syr: of Cloves, 1<sup>lb</sup> of Syr: of Marsh Mallows and 1<sup>lb</sup> 6<sup>oz</sup> of Syr: violat

11<sup>s</sup> 7<sup>d</sup>

8<sup>oz</sup> of Hunny of Roses, 1 $\frac{1}{2}$ <sup>lb</sup> of Syrup Buckthorne, 1<sup>lb</sup> of Treakel water, an old case of Lancets, a little Hanger, half a dram of Musk, a scrap of Civett

5<sup>s</sup> 3

Little brass morter, twenty eight pound and a half of lead, seaven pound of iron

17<sup>s</sup> 9<sup>d</sup>

Debts good and bad

10<sup>s</sup>

Little set of Drawers, some old boxes and boards

2<sup>s</sup> 6<sup>d</sup>

Lumber and things unseen and forgotten

2<sup>s</sup> 6<sup>d</sup>

sum total

£7 9 9 $\frac{1}{2}$ 

[No household furniture is given]

[Consistory Court Inventories for 1702]

\* I cannot explain these.



## II.

## TRANSCRIPT OF THE LIST OF BOOKS FOUND BY THE UNIVERSITY APPRAISERS IN THE HOUSE OF JOHN THOMAS, SURGEON. 20 OCTOBER 1545.

*In the Hall.*

Imprimis Calepinus	12 <sup>d</sup>
Item duo alii Calepini	3 <sup>s</sup> 4 <sup>d</sup>
„ Aulus Gellius	6 <sup>d</sup>
„ opera politiani ij libri	16 <sup>d</sup>
„ J. Brucherius (?) de luctu et sen...	12 <sup>d</sup>
„ Dialectica Titilmani	4 <sup>d</sup>
„ Ethica Arist: Melanct:	4 <sup>d</sup>
„ Dialectica Melanctonis	2 <sup>d</sup>
„ Grammatica hebraica bibliandri	6 <sup>d</sup>
Itm Tullius de Oratore cum aliis	16 <sup>d</sup>
Itm Galenus de elementis	12 <sup>d</sup>
„ idem de Sectis	12 <sup>d</sup>
„ Cesarius cum alio	8 <sup>d</sup>
* „ epistole Ciceronis	2 <sup>d</sup>
„ officia ejusdem	1 <sup>d</sup>
* „ Ausonius	3 <sup>d</sup>
„ Jacobus fasterenus (?) in phil...	1 <sup>d</sup>

*In the highest chamber.*

*Imprimis opus G. placentini in medicinam	4 <sup>d</sup>
*Itm Chirurgia Guidonis	8 <sup>d</sup>
Itm a legend in Frenche	12 <sup>d</sup>
*Itm Johannes de Vigo	6 <sup>d</sup>
„ due orationes Ciceronis	1 <sup>d</sup>
„ Francisci nigri epistole	1 <sup>d</sup>
Itm Faber in libros phisicorum aristot	12 <sup>d</sup>
Itm Sabellicus	6 <sup>d</sup>
*Itm an herball in French	4 <sup>d</sup>
„ Sobrinus de justitia	$\frac{1}{2}$ <sup>d</sup>
„ Rodolphi epithome [? Rodolphus Agricola]	2 <sup>d</sup>
„ Metaphisica Arist'	6 <sup>d</sup>
Itm Acolastus latine	1 <sup>d</sup>
„ Georgius Valla	8 <sup>d</sup>
* „ Horatius sine commentario	6 <sup>d</sup>

\* The items marked thus in the above list had been sold for the price named.

*Itm	Virgilius cum commentario	10 <sup>d</sup>
„	Dialectica Melanctonis	2 <sup>d</sup>
„	Annotationes Mostelani	6 <sup>d</sup>
* „	Fasciculus medicine	1 <sup>d</sup>
* „	Astronomia Guidonis	6 <sup>d</sup>
„	Novum testamentum	8 <sup>d</sup>
„	Regimen sanitatis magmini cum regimine februm	4 <sup>d</sup>
„	Grammatica greca Œcolampadii	4 <sup>d</sup>
„	Officia Ciceronis	4 <sup>d</sup>
* „	Rhetorica Tullii	6 <sup>d</sup>
„	alius Horatius	2 <sup>d</sup>
„	Instituta cum commentario	2 <sup>d</sup>
Itm	Agricola de inventione dialectice	4 <sup>d</sup>
Itm	Guido in French	4 <sup>d</sup>
„	legenda sanctorum cum aliis	8 <sup>d</sup>
*Itm	a frenche book without clasps or stryngs	12 <sup>d</sup>
Itm	Psalterium	2 <sup>d</sup>
Itm	Calepinus magnus	3 <sup>s</sup>
„	postilla Guillerini	4 <sup>d</sup>
„	lexicon greco-latinum	4 <sup>s</sup>
„	alius horatius sine commentario	4 <sup>d</sup>
* „	a missal of the small volume	4 <sup>d</sup>
„	Sallustius sine commentario	3 <sup>d</sup>
„	idem cum „	6 <sup>d</sup>
* „	articella super medicinam	8 <sup>d</sup>
„	Ethica Arist' cum commentario	2 <sup>d</sup>

Sum total xxxvj<sup>s</sup> iv<sup>d</sup> ob. (Roman numerals are  
used in the original.)

In another upper chamber is this item “xxxiiij books—xviijs.”

[University Inventories, Bdle 10.]

### III.

LIST OF BOOKS MADE BY THE UNIVERSITY APPRAISERS IN THE  
HOUSE OF ROBERT PICKERING, M.D., LATE OF ST MARY'S  
PARISH, CAMBRIDGE, 25 AUG. 1552.

opera galeni grece in 5 volumis	2 <sup>li</sup>
epithome „ latine in 5 volumis in 8 <sup>vo</sup>	6 <sup>s</sup> 8 <sup>d</sup>
Galenus de ossibus cum aliis	1 <sup>s</sup> 2 <sup>d</sup>
Galenus Methodus medendi	8 <sup>d</sup>
„ facultatibus simplicium	10 <sup>d</sup>
„ de sanitate tuenda	10 <sup>d</sup>

\* The items marked thus in the above list had been sold for the price  
named.



Galenus introductio grec et lat'	8 <sup>d</sup>
<sup>1</sup> Galenus de temperamentis greco-lat'	6 <sup>d</sup>
„ de facultatibus et c...	2 <sup>d</sup>
„ de compositione pharmac'	4 <sup>d</sup>
„ de differentiis febrium	2 <sup>d</sup>
„ de locis affectis	3 <sup>d</sup>
Galenus aliquot opuscula in parvo	2 <sup>d</sup>
„ Isagoge	6 <sup>d</sup>
Cornelius Celsus de re medica	1 <sup>s</sup>
Varignanus de morbis curandis [Lugd. 1539]	6 <sup>d</sup>
Brunsfelsius, Onomasticon medicine	2 <sup>s</sup>
„ Herbarium	3 <sup>s</sup> 4 <sup>d</sup>
„ Iatrionicis medicine in 2 vol	2 <sup>s</sup>
„ loci communes medicine	8 <sup>d</sup>
opera Arist' grece in 2 <sup>bus</sup> Vol	10 <sup>s</sup>
Ethica et politica Arist	6 <sup>d</sup>
opera Aetii	3 <sup>s</sup>
Mesue	5 <sup>s</sup>
Celius de antiquis lectionibus	6 <sup>s</sup> 8 <sup>d</sup>
Opera Avicen in 2 <sup>bus</sup> vol:	2 <sup>s</sup>
Parvum herbarium cum aliis	6 <sup>d</sup>
Anatomia mundini	1 <sup>s</sup> 4 <sup>d</sup>
Fasciculus medicine	1 <sup>s</sup> 4 <sup>d</sup>
Celius Arianus de rebus gestis grece	1 <sup>s</sup>
<sup>2</sup> Hortus gallicus capegi	6 <sup>d</sup>
Compendium Fuchsii	8 <sup>d</sup>
Epistole medicinales manardi	4 <sup>d</sup>
Simon Setus de facultatibus cibariorum, greco-lat'	2 <sup>d</sup>
Cornelius Celsus cum aliis	8 <sup>d</sup>
Fuchsius de morbis medendi in 2 <sup>bus</sup> vol	1 <sup>s</sup>
Rhasis	2 <sup>d</sup>
Paulus Aegineta	1 <sup>s</sup>
Aphorisma hipocrates greco-lat	6 <sup>d</sup>
Hipocrates de predictione	6 <sup>d</sup>
Fernelius de sanguinis ovaductione	4 <sup>d</sup>
„ de usu Pharmacorum	2 <sup>d</sup>
Psalterium grece	4 <sup>d</sup>
Precationes biblica	2 <sup>d</sup>
Psalterium latine	1 <sup>d</sup>
Enchiridion psalmorum	3 <sup>d</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Bowes, Cat. of Camb. Books, no. 1.

<sup>2</sup> This title is a puzzle.

Novum testamentum latine	8 <sup>d</sup>
Pars biblie in 3 <sup>bus</sup>	1 <sup>s</sup> 8 <sup>d</sup>
Opera platonis grece in 2 <sup>bus</sup> vol	10 <sup>s</sup>
Plinius in magno	2 <sup>s</sup> 4 <sup>d</sup>
Lexicon Grecum	4 <sup>s</sup>
Quedam opera Ciceronis in 2 <sup>bus</sup> magnis volumis	6 <sup>s</sup>
Plautus	8 <sup>d</sup>
Diodorus siculus grece	1 <sup>s</sup> 8 <sup>d</sup>
Pindar latine cum commentario	1 <sup>s</sup> 4 <sup>d</sup>
Esopi fabule grece et latine	1 <sup>s</sup> 2 <sup>d</sup>
Orationes Socratis grec	1 <sup>s</sup> 4 <sup>d</sup>
Aulus Gellius cum commentario	2 <sup>s</sup> 6 <sup>d</sup>
Theusidides grece	4 <sup>s</sup>
Herodotus grece	4 <sup>s</sup>
Herodianus grece	1 <sup>s</sup>
Pars Tullii	2 <sup>d</sup>
Ovidii metamorphoses cum commentario	4 <sup>d</sup>
epithome plutarchi	1 <sup>s</sup>
Luciani dialogi cum aliis	2 <sup>s</sup>
Lucianus grece in 2 <sup>bus</sup>	2 <sup>s</sup> 6 <sup>d</sup>
Apothegmata plutarchi	1 <sup>s</sup> 4 <sup>d</sup>
Virgilius	8 <sup>d</sup>
Grammatica Theodori gaze	4 <sup>d</sup>
Euripedes grec in 2 <sup>bus</sup>	1 <sup>s</sup> 8 <sup>d</sup>
Commentaria Cæsaris	1 <sup>s</sup>
Tragedio Euripedes in 2 <sup>bus</sup>	1 <sup>s</sup> 6 <sup>d</sup>
Valerius maximus	8 <sup>d</sup>
aliquot opuscula Tullii	4 <sup>d</sup>
Tragedie Senece	6 <sup>d</sup>
Quintilian	1 <sup>s</sup>
Homeri Ilias latine	6 <sup>d</sup>
Tullius de Oratore	2 <sup>d</sup>
Plinii Epistole	4 <sup>d</sup>
Valerius maximus	2 <sup>d</sup>
Instituti Justiniani	4 <sup>d</sup>
Descriptio orbis ...	4 <sup>d</sup>
elegantie valle	2 <sup>d</sup>
Laurentius valle de libero arbitrio cum aliis	6 <sup>d</sup>
Epithome Vadiani	8 <sup>d</sup>
Lucius florus et Justinus	8 <sup>d</sup>
Oecolampadius in epistolam ad hebreas	10 <sup>d</sup>
Hermogenes de arte rethoricis	10 <sup>d</sup>
Diversa opuscula Arist. lat:	6 <sup>d</sup>
Diodorus Siculus	10 <sup>d</sup>



Platina quedam opuscula	8 <sup>d</sup>
Quintus Curtius	10 <sup>d</sup>
Suetonius de vitis Cesarum	6 <sup>d</sup>
Herodianus latine cum aliis	8 <sup>d</sup>
Sulpitius	1 <sup>d</sup>
Martialis	6 <sup>d</sup>
Sallustius	3 <sup>d</sup>
Epistole Tullii	2 <sup>d</sup>
Metamorphosis Ovidii	2 <sup>d</sup>
Epistole „	3 <sup>d</sup>
Loci communes Eckii	4 <sup>d</sup>
Beotius cum commentario	2 <sup>d</sup>
Victorius super Ciceronem	10 <sup>d</sup>
Bolingerus ad galanthas	10 <sup>d</sup>
Gasparino epistolas ad (?) timoth' priorem	8 <sup>d</sup>
Rivalius de jure civile	8 <sup>d</sup>
eloquentie encomium cum aliis	8 <sup>d</sup>
Theophilactus in evangelia	1 <sup>s</sup>
Commentaria budei grece	2 <sup>s</sup> 4 <sup>d</sup>
Budeus de assise	1 <sup>s</sup> 2 <sup>d</sup>
Idem in pandectis	1 <sup>s</sup> 2 <sup>d</sup>
Introductiones fabri	2 <sup>d</sup>
Tabule astronomice	4 <sup>d</sup>
Onomasticon Julii Polucis	1 <sup>s</sup> 4 <sup>d</sup>
Boetius cum commentario	2 <sup>d</sup>
Margarita philosophia [G. Reisch]	8 <sup>d</sup>
Johannes Duns in 2 <sup>bus</sup>	2 <sup>s</sup>
Petrus Hebanus in problemata Arist	1 <sup>s</sup>
Diogenes laertius de vitis phorum	1 <sup>s</sup> 4 <sup>d</sup>
Tabule Tholomei	5 <sup>s</sup>
Facetie Pogii	6 <sup>d</sup>
Duo partes veteris instrumenti in 2 <sup>bus</sup>	8 <sup>d</sup>
Erasmi adagia in magno	5 <sup>s</sup>
Collectanea adagiarum Erasmi	8 <sup>d</sup>
Adagia Erasmi	2 <sup>d</sup>
Opera Ringelbergi	8 <sup>d</sup>
De constribendis epistolis lodovici	10 <sup>d</sup>
Trapezontius	10 <sup>d</sup>
Doletus de re navali & vestiaria	1 <sup>s</sup> 4 <sup>d</sup>
Vulgaria Harmandui [? Hormanii, Lond. 1519]	6 <sup>d</sup>
Scala perfectionis	1 <sup>d</sup>
Elegantie Valle cum aliis	1 <sup>s</sup> 4 <sup>d</sup>
Imago mundi	1 <sup>s</sup>
Luthurus in deuteronomium	1 <sup>s</sup>

Agrippa de occulta philosophia	1 <sup>s</sup> 4 <sup>d</sup>
Luminar' majus cum aliis [Lugd. 1537]	1 <sup>s</sup>
Grammatica theodori gaze cum aliis	2 <sup>s</sup>
Liber cartaceus	8 <sup>d</sup>
Nuge Borbonii	6 <sup>d</sup>
A luting book	2 <sup>d</sup>
<sup>1</sup> Erasmus de constribendis epistolis	10 <sup>d</sup>
Enchiridion Erasmi cum aliis	6 <sup>d</sup>
Compendium theologie Erasmi	4 <sup>d</sup>
<sup>1</sup> Idem de constribendis epistolis	2 <sup>d</sup>
Lingua Erasmi	4 <sup>d</sup>
52 books sum bound & unbound	3 <sup>s</sup> 4 <sup>d</sup>
Total	£10 14 4
[University Inventories, Bdle 7.]	

## IV.

## LIST OF ENGLISH AND FRENCH BOOKS POSSESSED BY THOMAS LORKIN, DR OF PHYSICKE, WHO DIED MAY, 1591.

*In the upper studie.*

Turner herball	5 0
Camdens histerie	2 6
Pultons Abstract	3 4
Brokes abridgement	13 4
Court lete et court baron	1 4
the abridgement of the books of assises	8
Liteltons tenures English	8
novel de les ans leroy Henrie 8 Edw 6 et lat reigne Marie	10
the dialogues between a doctor of divinitie & a student in the laws	8
Perkins book of the lawes	10
the exposition of the termes of the lawes	8
Another Lyteltons tenures french	6
the Magna Charta	1 0
the institutions or principall grownds of the lawes	3
Fortescue his commendation of the lawes of England	8
another natura brevium	10
A book of surveying	2
Fitzherbert of justices of Peace	1 2
a book of presedents	4

<sup>1</sup> Bowes, Cat. Camb. Books, no. 3024.



on other of justices of peace	3
the accedens of armorie	1 0
the concords of armorie	1 4
picta poesis	10
the booke of honor and armes	8
the blazon of Gentrye	3 4
the blazon of colours	3
emblemata Rensueri	2 6
Aschams Schoolmaster	6
Tussars husbandrie	6
The book of hawking etc	6
The republic Anglorū	4
Hadriani emblemata	10
The pictures of anatome	2 0
The psalmes in 4 parts	1 4
A treatise of English medicines	2
divers mapps pictures and tables	2 6

*In the nether studie*

A psalm book with a psalter	4
Caesars commentaries	6
Virgil	6
the treasurie of health	4
Stowes chronicle	1 0
Stubs anatomie of abuses	3
The behive of the Romish church	1 0
The exposition of Daniel by Melancthon	6
Annotations on Joshua in English	3
Eliots governor	3
the testament of the 12 patriarchs	3
Erasmus on the crede in English	3
The french psalmes	4
The difference of the olde phisique taught by godlie fathers and the new from Galen	3
a hundred and 14 experiments of paracelsus	2
Reubens de destillatione	10
the art of riding	1 4
the order of cureing horses	1 4
the moral of philosophie of doin	8
newes from the new found world	4
Thevets new found world	8
Crowlies psalmes of david	6
Jones his discourse of the beginning of things	6
discourses of the Turkish emperour	2

the payne of pleasure	2
Sylva synonymorū	1 0
Skeltons poems	2
Bales votaries	4
M. Aurelius	4
Mori utopia	3
The Mirror of health	2
A dictionarie for children	2
Books in lumber	8

The total number of books in the list is 570

[University Inventories, Bdle 4.]

Several of the books in the foregoing lists are not in Watt's *Bibliotheca Britannica*. Others are earlier editions than are mentioned by him.

---





## INDEX.

The names of Drugs and Books are not indexed.

See under 'DRUGS' and 'LIBRARIES.'

---

- Ady, Thomas, 205, 216  
Alington, Mr. 216  
Allot, Dr. 210, 258  
Ambrose, Robert, 204, 216  
Apothecaries' Company, 207  
Apprentices, 210, 211  
Argentine, Provost, 251  
Austin Friary, 238
- Bacon, MS. of Friar, 262  
Barber Surgeons, 207, 208  
Barham, 215  
Books of Doctors, *see* Libraries  
Bonesetters, 212  
Brampston, Lucy, 227  
Bright, Dr. Timothy, 261  
Brinkley, 204, 216  
Brydon, Thomas, 223—225,  
265  
Buck, Martin, 259  
Bulley, Dr. William, 202, 213  
Butler, Thomas, 252, 254  
Butler, Dr. William, 248, 252,  
265
- Cambridge and Oxford, Tables  
of, 264  
Cambridgeshire Doctors;  
Sources of information,  
200—206; Village  
practitioners, 213—220;  
Cambridge doctors,  
225—252  
Cauliac, Guy de, 259  
Chancery Proceedings, 211,  
228, 267  
Chatteris, 204  
Chemist and Druggist, 212  
Chesterton, 204, 205, 247
- Church Spoil of Doctors, 240,  
249, 266  
Clothes of Doctors, 232—233,  
237, 243, 246, 249, 250  
Cole, William, 251  
Collins, Dr. John, 208, 209,  
210, 218, 264  
Conveyance, Modes of, 264—  
266  
Coton, 204  
Cottenham, 204  
Crane, John, 249  
Crofts, Henry, 219, 264  
Crosley, John S., 212
- Day, Robert, 210  
Day, Thomas, 210, 259  
Deut, Peter, 210, 211  
Dee, John, 242  
Dobson, John, 267—269  
Dry Drayton, 205  
Drugs, 215, 219, 220—225, 231  
236, 242, 256—257,  
270, 271  
Duffield, Leonard, 207
- Eade, Dr. Robert, 209  
Ely, 204, 205, 219  
Eve, Dr. 256
- Fees, Doctors', 217, 225,  
252—257  
Fendown, 208  
Francis, Dr. John, 218, 265  
Freville, Mrs. Jane, 239  
Fue, William, 212  
Furniture of Doctors, 230,  
235, 241, 249



## INDEX.

Furtho, Dr. John, 262, 264

Gager, William, 202

Galen, 232, 260, 261

Gayles, Mrs. 252

Gerard's *Herbal*, 210

Glyn, Dr. 251

Gostling, Dr. Thomas, 210

Gout, recipe for, 215, 216

Grace Books, 206

Grades of medical practitioners,  
206—213

"Gratia dei," Ointment called,  
224

Gray, Bishop, 226

Grimston, Dr. T. 264

Grocers' Company, 207

Hammond, Widow, stocking  
mender, 210

Harvey, John, 253

Harrison, Mr. 255

Hatcher, Dr. John, 212,  
238—245, 246, 261, 265

Hayes, Henry, 220, 270, 271

Horses, Doctors,' 264—265

Horner, Mrs. 214

Ickleton, 204, 216

Instruments, Surgical, 231,  
257—259

Inventories, 206

Jeffery, John, 255

Jenkins, Dr. 256

Jones, Dr. Thomas, 265

Lancashire Cloth, 246

Lemster, Walter, 225, 229

Lewis, John, 202

Libraries of Doctors, 215,

Libraries of Doctors, *Cont.*  
237—238, 244, 247,  
259—263,

Licenses to practice physic,  
201—205

Linen, Table-, of Doctors, 218

Linton, 211, 213, 214, 216,  
217, 225, 255

Lloyd, Mr. 217

Lorkyn, Dr. Thomas, 245—247  
262, 263, 277—279

Love, Richard, 206—207

Loveland, Joseph, 210

Manus Christi, 242

Maps, 236, 241, 246, 263, 234

March, 204, 219

Marshall Thomas, 219, 258,  
264

Mason, George, 255

Meakes, Richard, 208

Medical Acts, 201, 203

Medical Fees, 217, 225,  
254—257

Medical Libraries, 215,  
259—263

Melbourn, 204, 212, 267

Meldreth, 204, 255, 256

Midwives, 203—206

Morley, Henry, 219

Muriel, Dr. 257

Murrow Bank, 252

Musical Instruments, 238, 246

Narborough, Richard, 227

Newmarket, 248

Nichols, Dr. 264

Padua, 227

Papworth, John, 202

Paris, Sir Philip, 202, 213—214

Parman, John, 211, 259

Parsonsdrove, 205, 252

## INDEX.

Paske, John, 207, 258, 265  
 Perse, Dr. Stephen, 244, 250  
 Pharmacopœia Londonensis, 210  
 Pickering, Robert, 234—238  
     260, 265, 273—277  
 Pictures, 237, 240, 241, 249  
     263—264  
 Plate, Gold and Silver, 237,  
     243, 247, 249, 251  
 Poley, John, 211  
 Pratt, John, 229  
 Price, Mr. 251  
 Probate Records, 217

Quail net, 234

Ray, John, 211  
 Recipes, Medical, 215  
 Rochell, Thomas, 211

St. Anthony's Fire, 251  
 Salerno, Rule of, 259, 260  
 Sams, Dr. 255  
 Sayes, Mr. 253  
 Shepreth, 204  
 Shops, Doctors,' 231, 236, 242  
 Shudy Camps, 204, 205, 216  
 Smith, Richard, 211  
 Soham, 210  
 Soward, John, 258—260, 266  
 Spectacles, 246  
 Stacey, John, 214, 215  
 Stanground, 265  
 Surgical Instruments, 231,  
     257—259  
 Swaffham Bulbeck, 267  
 Sweating Sickness, 234  
 Swetson Dorcas, 209, John, 209

Talwin, Dr. John, 256  
 Thomas, John, 207, 229—234,  
     260, 266, 272, 273

Treatment, 251, 255—257

Vesey family, 207  
 Vicary's *Englishman's Treasure* 260  
 Vigo, John de, 210, 232, 260

Wells, Dr. Robert, 264  
 West Wratting, 217  
 Whittlesey, 204, 205  
 Widdows, or Willows, Dr.  
     Richard, 207, 214, 258,  
     260

Wilbore, Thomasina, 205  
 Wilbraham, Little, 213  
 Willingham, 212  
 Willows, George, 215  
 Willows, Richard, *see* Widdows  
 Wimpole, 210  
 Winterton, Dr. Ralph, 208, 209  
 Wisbech, 204, 220, 270  
 Witchcraft, 253  
 Wren, Bishop, Visitations of,  
     203—206  
 Wright, Edmund, 227

Yorke, Bishop, his household  
     bills, 257















